EMPIRE CLUB SPEECHES

1938-39

EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1938unse

J. P. PRATT, Esq., K.C.

President of The Empire Club of Canada, 1938-39

EMPIRE CLUB
OF
CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1938-39

Thirty-sixth Year of Issue

GOD SAVE THE KING

TORONTO:
THE MACLEAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED

Copyright, Canada, 1939
The Empire Club of Canada

PRINTED IN CANADA
THE MACLEAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, LIMITED
TORONTO, ONT.

CONTENTS

Officers and Committee ix

ADDRESSES:

Australia and the Empire 1
Rt. Hon. Sir Earle Page, P.C., G.C.M.G., M.B., M.P.

Empire Unity—The Bulwark of Civilization 19
Brig.-General Sir Henry Page Croft, Bart., C.M.G., M.P.

The Land Speed Record 30
Captain George E. T. Eyston, M.C.

The Theatre as We Know It 41
Sir Cedric Hardwicke

Britain in India 55
Sir Firozkhan Noon, K.C.I.E., M.A. (Oxon)

Trans-Canada Air Lines 69
Philip G. Johnson, Esq.

Why Waste Money on Art Galleries? 83
W. G. Constable, Esq.

A Norseman Died in Ontario 900 Years Ago 96
J. W. (Jim) Curran, Esq.

Democracies and Exhibitions 110
The Right Honourable The Earl of Elgin

Palestine in Retrospect and Prospect 122
Alvah L. Miller, Esq.

Britain Faces Germany 138
Willson Woodside, Esq.

Present Day Problems 153
The Honourable Mitchell F. Hepburn

What is the British Point of View? 171
Lieut.-Colonel James Mess

Can We Achieve Canadian Unity? 184
Monsieur Jean-Charles Harvey

Spain—Its Internal Issues and Repercussions as Affecting The British Empire 200
Lieut.-Colonel J. R. J. MacNamara, M.P.

Canada and the British Empire 214
Captain R. G. Cavell

The Reich and the German Minorities 230
Klaus Mann, Esq.

A Modern Crusade Against Crime 243
Hugh H. Clegg, Esq.

Conflicts of Doctrines in Europe 256
Jan Masaryk, Esq.

Training Britain's Youth 270
Jasper H. Stembridge, Esq., F.R.G.S.

Canada's Tourist Industry 282
D. Leo Dolan, Esq.

"The Ides of March" 301
George A. Drew, Esq., K.C., M.P.P.

The Tennessee Valley Authority 313
Dr. William Sherwood Fox, B.A., M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.C.

The European Checkerboard 328
Rex Frost, Esq.

London to Paris to Rome 348
Gregory Clark, Esq.

National Policy—1939 Version 361
Norman M. MacLeod, Esq.

Canada's Defence Forces 377
Brigadier R. O. Alexander, D.S.O.

Our Democratic Heritage 393
W. J. Lindal, Esq., K.C.

Annual Meeting 410

Annual Financial Statement 415

Honorary and Past Presidents 416

Officers and Committee—Year 1939-40 417

Constitution 418

Life Members 423

Resident Members 423

Non-Resident Members 433

Resolution—

"The Empire Club of Canada, looking forward with eager loyalty to the expected visit of the King and Queen to Canada, respectfully requests His Excellency the Governor-General, to convey to their Majesties an expression of the devotion of its members to the Crown and Person of the Sovereign, their humble duty and deep affection towards Her Majesty, and their happiness that in present troublous times the British Commonwealth of Nations is looking with unquestioning confidence to their King and Queen as representing all that is finest and most glorious in British history and tradition.

"The members of the Empire Club of Canada reaffirm their allegiance to Canada and a United Empire, their conviction that the close association, sincere co-operation and mutual loyalty of Canada and the Mother Country are necessary to the freedom and prosperity of both and their earnest desire that Canada with the other peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations shall work in harmony and mutual confidence to ensure, at whatever cost, the safety of free institutions."

Adopted March 30, 1939.

Acknowledgment—

"The Private Secretary is commanded by The King to convey His Majesty's sincere thanks to The Empire Club of Canada for its message of loyal assurances."

"OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE"

Year 1938-39

Patron:

FIELD MARSHAL H. R. H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT
AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G.

Honorary President:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD
TWEEDSMUIR, G.C.M.G., C.H.
Governor-General of Canada.

President: J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
First Vice-President: W. Maclachlan, Esq.
Second Vice-President: Canon H. F. D. Woodcock
Third Vice-President: F. A. Gaby, Esq., D.Sc.
Hon. Secretary-Treasurer: H. C. Bourlier, Esq.
Hon. Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, Esq.

Executive Committee:

R. C. Berkinshaw, Esq.
F. L. Clouse, Esq.
L. Crawford-Brown, Esq.
G. R. M. Dingle, Esq.
G. O. Fleming, Esq.
R. Fleming, Esq.
D. H. Gibson, Esq.
H. Harpham, Esq.
L. Junkin. Esq.
F. B. Matthews, Esq.
H. F. Powell, Esq.
F. Pullen, Esq.
H. L. Southall, Esq.
J. D. Spence, Esq., K.C.
D. Stewart, Esq.
E. F. Thompson, Esq.
H. Webster, Esq.

Immediate Past President: R. M. Harcourt, Esq.

Past Presidents:

Dr. Elias Clouse, F. B. Fetherstonhaugh. Esq., K.C.
Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart

"AUSTRALIA AND THE EMPIRE"

AN ADDRESS BY

RT. HON. SIR EARLE PAGE, P.C., G.C.M.G., M.B., M.P.

Monday, August 8, 1938

On Monday, August 8th, 1938, The Empire Club of Canada held a special meeting, in conjunction with the Toronto Board of Trade, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Club, the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, in co-operation with the Australian Trade Commission. Colonel K. R. Marshall, President of the Toronto Board of Trade, presided.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Sir Earle Page, Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen: I shall call on the honourable Mr. Dewan and the Honourable W. D. Euler, to say a few words. The Honourable Mr. Euler, Minister of Trade and Commerce in the Federal Government, requires no introduction. The Honourable Mr. Euler. (Applause)

HONOURABLE W. D. EULER: Mr. Chairman, Sir Earle Page, Mr. Mayor and Gentlemen of Toronto: Let me say at the outset that I am not going to abuse the injunction placed upon me, unexpectedly, that I should confine my remarks to two and one half minutes. For that reason, I desire merely to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your hospitality in asking me to be here to meet again my old friend, Sir Earle Page. I met Dr. Page (at that time) two years ago in London, England. A year or more ago I visited his own great country of Australia and there had to do with him in the negotiations for a new trade agreement with that country which buys so much of Canada's goods, and I wish merely to say of him, and this is for Canadians, that it was owing more to Dr. Earle Page, as he was at that time, that we concluded successfully our negotiations than to anyone else and Canada has no better friend anywhere than the present Minister of Commerce of the great Commonwealth of Australia. (Applause)

I merely say in conclusion that he thinks, as I do, that when it comes to the making of trade agreements, whether it is between the different Commonwealths of the Empire or with other countries, that the only basis on which agreements can successfully be made is that they shall be mutually satisfactory. That is the principle on which he works, that is the principle on which I try to work, as well.

I am very glad indeed to be here, and to extend a most cordial welcome on behalf of the Government of Canada, and say to you again, in conclusion, that you are especially honoured today because this is Sir Earle Page's birthday.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Euler. I would like to call on the Honourable Mr. Dewan, Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario, to say a few words.

HONOURABLE P. M. DEWAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir Earle Page, Gentlemen: It is a very happy honour that comes to me today to extend a welcome on behalf of the Government of Ontario to Sir Earle Page and I am privileged to extend to you, Sir, a hearty, a very hearty welcome to the Province of Ontario. I know we are all going to benefit by the visit of Sir Earle Page to this Province. We cannot fail to benefit from the visits of members of the Empire who have had the long and valued experience in public life that Sir Earle Page has had. This country and his have many things in common. We have history that is common and though it is true, I believe, that they refer to his Continent as the Continent that has never known a war, we haven't had that happy privilege, though we have had peace for many, many years. I notice they have had a little internal war in Australia, deciding where the Capital should be located. We had a similar one, but some years before you had yours in Australia.

We have many things in common, particularly with regard to trade matters and I am sure our guest feels very happy, as all of us do here in this Dominion and in this Province of Ontario, because we are interested in finding a market for our natural products, at the statement made not many days ago by the Prime Minister of Great Britain when he said it would be folly on the part of the United Kingdom to attempt to attain to self sufficiency in the production of food products, that it would be akin to crippling trade with Empire countries and curtailing trade in other foreign markets where other manufacturers must find a sale for their products and goods.

I would like to say more but I, too, was given two minutes and a half. I am going to have the happy privilege during the remainder of the day of visiting the Ontario Agricultural College in company with Sir Earle Page. It was very gratifying to me to learn that he was interested in a visit to that institution and I hope that he and Lady Page will return to their native country with happy memories of this visit to the Province of Ontario.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: I am going to call on our own Mayor for a few words. His Worship, Mayor Day.

MAYOR DAY: Mr. President, Honourable Sirs, Gentlemen: I have the honour, on behalf of all my fellow citizens, to greet our guest of honour today. I am sure we are very, very happy indeed that he has found time to come and be with us today. We are extremely glad to see so many from other parts of our own Empire with us today.

I am interested, as we all are, in the benefit of our own people, primarily, and on behalf of Canadians, as well as people of the rest of the Empire. We have here with us today, and it is my pleasure to introduce him to you, Mr. Handley Page.

(Applause)

MR. F. HANDLEY PAGE: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: We are here to entertain somebody who seems to me to have an exceedingly good kind of surname and to me it is particularly pleasant to be able to welcome somebody who is a namesake of my own, particularly on his birthday.

We, in Great Britain, are also very fortunate in having had a visit from Sir Earle Page. (Wonderful how that name sounds to me when I repeat it!) We have been able to set in being the Empire Air Mail, in the negotiations of which he played a part as between the Old Country and Australia. And now, very shortly, we are going to set in being a mail service between Canada and Great Britain and I feel very pleased and very honoured to meet on the soil of Canada somebody of my own name of a very much more distinguished character, and to be able to greet him as someone who has taken a great part in that link that is helping to forge the Empire together.

If at any moment I sit down rather abruptly, please do not think it is because I don't want to go on addressing you. I believe at a quarter past one, precisely, Sir Earle Page must talk on the broadcasting system, and however wonderful and Shakespearian my language may be it is cut off in turn by what you term the programme or the schedule.

Well, Gentlemen, it is very fine to be over in this country. Unfortunately, the British Air Mission has come at what may seem to some people the wrong time of year, because we have come in the middle of summer holidays, whereas, according to industrialists, we should have come at Christmas.

Gentlemen, that is all I have to say. I am merely the preface "Page." The volume will now commence.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: We will have a word from Mr. W. D. Black, the President of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

MR. W. D. BLACK: Honoured Guest, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: Among the bonds uniting the British Empire are the visits of distinguished and honoured citizens. One of those is that of our guest today, the Right Honourable Sir Earle Page, P.C., G.C.M.G., M.B., M.P., Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Commerce of Australia. He is distinguished in his own profession, surgery, and served with distinction with the Australian forces in the Great War. After long experience in public life as Leader of a party and a member of two Coalition Governments, he has today atttained the position of prominence which he now holds. He is a member of the Australian Trade Delegation which has recently visited the United Kingdom and he is now on his way home.

Australia and Canada are united in partnership in the Empire which in these troublous days as in the past is a priceless heritage. They are united in their common origin, language, ways of living, aspirations and ideas. Together they passed through the ordeal of the Great War. They are interested in material things. In the past year the total trade between Australia and Canada amounted to upwards of 45 millions, as compared with 20 millions in 1930. There is still a lot of room for co-operation for our own mutual benefit in trade and other matters.

Sir Earle Page is now on his way home. I understand he is stopping off in Washington, with the possibility of further opening up trade relations there. It is such visits as his that tend to promote our common objectives.

Gentlemen, I have much pleasure in introducing to you Sir Earle Page.

(Applause)

RT. HON. SIR EARLE PAGE: P.C., G.C.M.G., M.B., M.P.: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Euler, Mr. Dewan, Mr. Handley Page, Mr. Black, Gentlemen: I am very pleased indeed today that the Board of Trade, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the various Clubs of Toronto have given me the opportunity of meeting so many of the representative citizens of Canada at this gathering, because we always welcome the opportunity of meeting as many of our fellow Empire citizens as we can. We from Australia of course often visit Canada. This is the fourth time I have come here, but you, unfortunately, do not very often visit us, and when you do we appreciate very highly indeed the visits of your public men. Only a year ago Mr. Euler, your Minister of Trade and Commerce, came to Australia for the purpose of making a trade negotiation. He carried himself with such courtesy and suavity that it wasn't until he was well on the way home to Canada that we found he had got all he wanted without us knowing it.

We felt something like the Turk did in that famous duel that took place on Gallipoli. On the Gallipoli field there was a Turk in the trenches on one side and a Gurkha on the other side, and they watched each other for a few days. Finally, they marched into No Man's Land for personal conflict. The Turk had his bayonet and the Gurkha had his *kukri*. The Turk made the first jab and the Gurkha said, "Ah, you missed me that time." As he said this the Gurkha made a swipe with his *kukri*. The Turk said, "Ah, you missed me, too." The Gurkha said, "Wait until you shake your head." (Laughter)

He had him cut off so clean that he didn't know his head was off. That was really the position we were in ourselves, as a result of the extraordinary capacity of Mr. Euler.

Prior to his coming we had been pleased to welcome other famous Canadian citizens and representative men. I remember the late Mr. Robb came some thirteen or fourteen years ago and negotiated the first trade agreement I think we had with Canada. Subsequently, at the opening of the Australian Parliament at the new Capital, Mr. Lapointe came out from Canada to represent your Dominion and in fact your Dominion presented to our Senate its Presidential chair, made of Canadian timber, which we show to all our visitors with extraordinary pride. A year or so ago your late Prime Minister, Mr. Bennett, came and traversed the whole of Australia and gave us an opportunity of hearing his views, which we were very glad indeed to hear. Also, trade delegations have come out. Mr. J. H. MacDonald, of British Columbia, came out and told us what they thought of us in British Columbia. We didn't mind it because he seemed to have a pretty good opinion of Australians. Just more recently some of your representative producers have come out to attend the Empire

Producers Conference, held in Sydney, the results of which I think will be far reaching in so far as Imperial relations and co-operation and co-ordination are concerned. We appreciate these visits very much and we try to reciprocate as far as we can in making ourselves known to you.

To that end we established in Toronto some few years ago an Australian Trade Commissioner's Office, to which Mr. Macgregor was appointed and we, in Australia, have a very high appreciation of the manner in which Mr. Macgregor carried out his duties here and we are very pleased to find the high regard in which he is held and his many personal friendships among you, and especially to find the extraordinary assistance all the people of Canada seem to have given him, particularly those of Toronto, in doing his job. We do appreciate that very much. He has Mr. Ellen with him, his assistant, who is getting to know you as well, and we will always have a first class Trade Commissioner here. You need not be frightened that he is going to be shifted away permanently. It is only a temporary arrangement.

As well, we have always endeavoured to try to keep the name of Australia emblazoned on your banner by competing at your Canadian National Exhibition, held in Toronto, and last year we were pleased to be awarded, and the President of the Exhibition assured us it was awarded on merit, the gold medal at that Exhibition.

Of course, being so far away on the outskirts of the world we have to adopt many unusual methods of attracting notice to ourselves. We have four principal methods of trying to ensure that the rest of the world takes notice of us. One of the most valuable we have found is to induce people to lend us as much of their money as we can get them to do, because we find where their money is there their heart seems to be also. One of the reasons we have always been able to get a favourable hearing in Great Britain is that Australia is the greatest investment Great Britain has. There is more British money invested in Australia than in any other part of the world, whether in the Empire or outside.

No less than 25 per cent of her Empire investment and some 16 per cent of the total overseas investment of Great Britain, is in Australia, and we are glad to know a certain amount of Canadian money is going out there as well. Not nearly enough but we are always hoping for the best.

The second method we adopt to try and create a good impression is to sell as much of our goods as we can to satisfied customers, especially in Canada and in Great Britain and inside the Empire and outside, too: we have enough to go around. We insist that the goods we send from Australia are goods of the highest possible quality. My own Department of Commerce has administered some of the most stringent regulations with regard to quality that any of the countries of the world has. When you buy Australian goods you know you are getting real goods.

Another way of ingratiating ourselves with people far away from us is to buy as much of their goods as we can, and I think we have ourselves in the position, although we only have some seven millions of people, that we are the third customer in point of size of Canada. I think we come after Great Britain and the United States. We are the third customer in volume and in value of the Dominion of Canada. We are anxious that whatever trade negotiations are concluded will be negotiations that will endeavour to expand the trade of Canada and Australia on both sides. We want to see an expanding trade. We don't want simply a negotiation to divert a share of existing trade to some other quarter. What we want to do is share an expanding trade.

And the last method we have adopted to try to give ourselves a decent reputation in the world is to always pay on the nail our just debts and commitments, and to ensure that we have incorporated in our Constitution certain safeguards for our creditors that really have no parallel anywhere in the world. We might say, with the safeguards we have at the present time for public indebtedness, it is impossible really for any repudiation of interest or repayment to take place. That was carried through by means of what we call the Financial Agreement which I, as Treasurer of the Commonwealth, was instrumental in getting placed in our Constitution in 1928, and no action of any single Parliament or all the Parliaments of Australia can really alter that Agreement. It can only be altered by specific vote of the people. I think you all realize there is not the slightest chance of a British community such as ours carrying a vote to alter such an agreement. Our obligations in this respect really take priority over our ordinary parliamentary appropriations. Even on the payment of Members of Parliament themselves there is a priority for the payment of our interest and of our debts. Consequently, when you are asked to invest in Australia in a public sense you can do so with the utmost confidence and also if you are asked to invest in a private undertaking. You can understand, and we believe this sincerely, that this is going to be Australia's century, just as the last century was America's.

We are glad to have an opportunity of coming to speak to you, personally, because when we read some of your papers and hear some of your comments, we realize that you sometimes misunderstand what we are doing.

We feel ourselves somewhat in the position of the last man in the message squadron during the war. During the war a certain number of men, usually eight, were detailed to try to carry messages along. The first man with a special message would deliver it to a second man who would give it to a third, and finally eight men would report. I remember on one occasion the message was given to the first man to carry up the line, to tell the General that six cylinders of poison gas had arrived. When the eighth man turned up his message was that the General's wife had poisoned herself in a six-cylinder car.

The stories you hear of Australia are somewhat of that nature. Like Mark Twain's death, they are rather grossly exaggerated. We are anxious to correct those misunderstandings because we believe there was never a time in the history of the world and especially in the history of the British Empire when it was more important that these great free democracies should understand what each other thinks, what each other visualizes as its proper aims and objectives, and what each other should actually do. We believe that there is only one way in which the world can be rescued from this welter of chaos and of disorganization and that is by the strength and by the action, first of all, of the combined forces of the British Empire, and if possible by those forces working as well with the great sister nation, the United States, the other great English-speaking country. We believe that the only way in which there can be prosperous peace throughout the whole world is by some such combination of these two great forces.

We are satisfied that we control something like 40 per cent of the total trade of the world at the present time. We are absolutely convinced that war always makes more problems than it solves. In fact, my experience is that war doesn't solve any problem. It really increases the difficulties of those problems that we already have. It leaves behind a legacy of bitterness which prevents even reasonable propositions being examined sanely and without passion. Consequently, we feel that we must have some organization, some combination, some co-operation that will ensure peace.

International appeasement, no matter what is said about the return of colonies and all this sort of thing, will not come from any one physical action. It can only come from the restoration and increase of international trade and the very fact of international trade being in existence and being operative is a clear indication of the mutual interdependence of every country, one upon another. None of us can be self-sufficient. There cannot be anything like a substantial restoration of international trade except if first of all we can get political stability. No one would be inclined to invest in or expand his business or buy new equipment or enter into new undertakings unless he has some sense of certainty of the future. I do not think there can be any certainty of the future except these two great English-speaking nations first of all make themselves strong enough for all the world to see that if necessary they will fight to attain the ideals of democracy and freedom, and having given that certainty, the world will have peace. All that is necessary in my view to have peace is to get strong enough to enforce peace. Having done that, let us enter upon a planned policy of co-operation for restarting the wheels of international trade by the resumption of international lending and especially by lowering those impediments to trade, those barriers to the interchange of goods created in this mad panic of the present.

There is no doubt, if one looks at the world today, one must realize there is an economic jam that prevents any real progress being made. That economic jam is really situated in Europe, especially in those countries which are trying to be absolutely self-sufficient. We used to be self-sufficient in Australia, completely self-supporting. We had no import or export trade in Australia at one time. You know when that was. That was before Captain Cook discovered Australia, when the black fellows had possession, when our standard of living was the lowest in the world, and that is where absolute self-sufficiency ultimately will get every nation. What does the world exist for, except to have goods and benefits and opportunities distributed right throughout its whole length?

Now, this economic jam really exists in Europe. It is there that the first efforts must be made. They tell me that here at Niagara Falls when you get a really bad ice jam you put a stick of dynamite in to blow up the ice so the water will start to run again. We don't want too much dynamite in Europe at the present time. There seems to be an over supply already. I don't think that is really the way to proceed, but this economic jam has really occurred in Europe from this reason. They have a set policy in agriculture. They have diverted their farmers from their proper job of producing eggs and fresh fruit and vegetables and milk, and some of which they can do quite economically and which they really have got to do to provide food for their people, to the growing of wheat and meat and those other things which we in the primary production countries can grow ever so much more cheaply than they. As a result of that there has been an extraordinary lowering of the standard of living. That cannot really be appreciated unless one takes the articles that really matter, one by one, and examines them relative to what is happening in English-speaking countries. For example, the consumption of eggs, which is nearly a perfect food—there are more vitamins in eggs than in any other one food—in Canada is 284 eggs per year per head, in Germany it is only 129 and in Italy, 119. Australia's consumption of meat is 202 lb. per head, compared with 110 lb. in Germany and 35 lb. in Italy. Australia consumes 102 gallons of milk products, compared with 79 gallons in Germany and 23 gallons in Italy.

These are the foods which produce especially the protective vitamins. Though they may not make you fat and look healthy, those vitamins keep you healthy and resistant to all forms of disease, so you understand the reason for the deterioration really taking place in Germany and other countries at the present time.

If we could get back to a normal trade system in which these countries would grow and produce things for themselves, as the health of the people demands they should grow them for themselves, and the health of the people in these countries themselves demands this, then we would sell them these heavy, easily transportable products of ours—our beef, meat, butter and so on. We have to sell those products to be able to buy other products from them as we used to do in the old days, and we would gradually have multilateral trade established again with widening circles of beneficial influence. If we could raise the standard of consumption of articles to anything approaching the standard in the English-speaking countries at the present time, look at the enormous increased volume of international trade thereby created. That is the only way we can get back to anything like general world prosperity and general world improvement. If we do that, the improvement in the world's standard of living would have a consequent effect on the world's general outlook through the improvement in physical health. As a doctor I am very much interested in those things. I believe about ninety per cent of our political diseases have been the result of the diseased condition of the rulers of the world. They have been a bit jaundiced and have gone to war because they couldn't agree with their neighbours. I am sure if they were well and healthy they would be in a much better state of mental tranquility than when eating things that do not agree with them at all.

Apart from that, if we are going to get the world cured, we must try to see how we are going to increase the total world trade. So the problem before the statesmen and business leaders of the world will no longer be the question of diverting from one country or one section a certain portion of existing trade to another. That is a useless sort of thing, a very uncommercial and uneconomic and unsatisfactory thing. We want to be in the position of sharing a continually expanding trade. This idea of having thousands and millions of our acres out of production seems to me to be a crime against civilization. No country can be said to be making real progress when it prevents production in that way. (Applause)

Now, in this restoration of international trade the members of the British Empire and the United States have an overwhelming interest. The British Empire is responsible for 28 per cent of the foreign trade of the world, the United States for another 12 per cent. Between the two, they are responsible for 40 per cent of the total foreign trade of the world. It seems to me, to secure the widest possible benefits we need co-operation and combined action between the various members of the British Empire first. Then, having secured that, negotiations should be opened with the United States to get the widest possible comprehensive agreement that touches the whole field. A narrow agreement won't do very much good but a wide agreement will start the wheels of industry moving in a swift and certain way.

First of all, we have got to make certain that we have full co-operation inside the Empire. Some six years ago you in Canada took the lead in bringing about a very considerable improvement in the measure of co-operation and I am very pleased to be here in Toronto where your Board of Trade was the pioneer of the Empire preferential idea before any other part of the Empire really brought it down. In that agreement we arranged to exchange products, one with the other. There is no question, despite what the critics say, these agreements have brought about a very much wider area of freer trade in this great British Empire, which occupies one quarter of the surface of the globe and has one third of the people of the human race, than was before possible. The very fact that it has increasingly improved the trade in the whole of the area has been a good thing for the whole world. You can't have one part of the body diseased and returning to health without the whole body being less fevered and troublesome than it was before.

We in Australia have done our part in connection with this attempt to try this inside the Empire. Despite our bad reputation we have tried to play our part in this regard. We have some 2,000 items in our tariff schedule and there have been no less than 1,600 reductions in the British preferential rate during the past six years, and 600 foreign reductions have been made as well in that time. As a result we have emerged from our difficulties probably more quickly than anyone else.

We feel that that co-operation we have exercised inside the Empire should be extended to cover our bargaining with the United States and we believe simultaneous and comprehensive agreements are necessary to get the widest and most complete range of benefits. The United States has already made some twenty treaties with different countries during the last two or three years.

I read one of the most extraordinary books by one of the most notable authors the other day, and he said the effect on world trade was almost unappreciable, it was insignificant because it didn't touch the root of the matter. We have a chance of touching the root of the matter if we deal with this thing in a wide way, if we deal with the Empire as a whole, rather than individual parts. You must remember, Britain has given certain concessions to the Dominions; the Dominions have given certain concessions to Britain and to each other which, without an all round discussion, may stand in the way of the most satisfactory and widest beneficial treaty with the United States.

I make an appeal that these negotiations at the present time should not be conducted simply between the United States and individual members of the Empire, but they should be conducted simultaneously between the United States, Great Britain and the Dominions, and if there is simultaneous action by all very much better results will be attained.

This is necessary, of course, from the method by which the United States does its bargaining. The United States has two essential factors in its trade arrangements. The first is that it will only make a trade agreement with another country when that country is the principal supplier of a certain commodity. When it does make a concession, that concession is carried into every other treaty it makes. It is quite obvious that no country can be the principal supplier of every commodity. We in Australia are the principal supplier of wool; New Zealand is the principal supplier of mutton and lamb. If treaties are made simultaneously all will be getting the benefit. We may not think what we are getting on one commodity is worth while bargaining for on another.

Therefore I make an appeal—I made it in Great Britain and I make it here—that the discussions with the United States to really start again the wheels of international trade in the best possible way, should be carried out within the widest possible sphere.

I only want to say two or three words regarding the position of Canada and Australia. We regret very much indeed that Canada doesn't buy more of our goods. I think Mr. Black said we buy a very great deal from you, an increasing amount from you. Of course you buy a little more from us than you did. I came over some fifteen years ago and we were buying 20 times as much from you as you were buying from us. It is now down to three times as much. Not so good, yet very much better than it was.

We believe there are many ways in which you can help in this regard and I am certain you have only to be reminded of the position and you will get busy and make certain that the situation is helped. It can be helped in several ways. One is by trade negotiations. The other is by your investment in our country. The third is by better means of communication with Australia. We are very interested in an improved system of communications across the Pacific and Australia will be ready to join with Canada and New Zealand in improving the quality of ships. We have been disappointed at the unavoidable delay in construction. We do desire very much indeed that there should be a continuation and an improvement, if possible, in the ships from the east side of Canada right through to Australia, because this is where the great bulk of population is. This is where we desire to send our products to be sold in the greatest quantity.

This is a matter you can deal with yourselves. During the last three or four months I have been in London arguing the question of Australian-British trade relations. We have rather tried to keep off the question of arguing about detailed items there because we had hoped to try and lay down some broad plans of Empire negotiation and of Empire treatment of one part of the Empire with another, and that would be applicable not only to Australia and Great Britain. As you will be glad to know, a fortnight ago, on July 20th, a White Paper was presented in the British Parliament which embodied the results of our discussion which broke a great deal of new ground and satisfied, so far as could be satisfied at the present time, the Australian desires for revision of the Ottawa Treaty, but it laid down a couple of new ideas with regard to our trade.

One of the most important things, and this is one of two points, was the explicit recognition by Great Britain of the necessity for the sound progress of, and rapid development of, Australian secondary industry for the purpose of Empire defence. That is something we had a great deal of trouble getting recognition of from the British Government and the British manufacturers before, but that is actually and cordially expressed in this agreement.

Another point is emphasized and that is this; that the people of the Empire be looking forward all the time to expanding trade inside one another's borders. In order to do that we believe the right way to proceed is to try and secure such organization of producers, both in the secondary industries and in the primary industries as will be able to talk to those in other parts of the Empire and agree to a line of development that will not unduly conflict with what is taking place in the other Dominions; to be able to interchange as many products as we can and be sure the ultimate conflict that may take place when we become fully productive, be as long deferred as it possibly can.

We are going back to hold an enquiry in Australia into the whole industrial structure from that point of view, not only to see what we ought to do, not merely from Australia's and Britain's and Canada's but from every other country's point of view toward building the house and putting the scaffolding out in such a way that others will be able to build alongside us and make an Empire so strong, so invincible that it will be practically able to ensure and guarantee the peace of the world for this century. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Sir Earle Page, on behalf of the following organizations, which contributed to this luncheon, I wish to thank you: The Board of Trade of the City of Toronto, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Club, the Empire Club of Canada, the Kiwanis Club and the Rotary Club. We have enjoyed very much indeed listening to your illuminating address on trade relations and your suggestions for our future conduct of Empire trade. I couldn't help but get the feeling myself that it was a very good thing we had such an able statesman as the Honourable Mr. Euler to deal with you, Sir, as I haven't the slightest doubt you would make a very good trade if you were dealing with horses. We have listened to this speech with a great deal of interest and it has contained a great deal of commonsense. We thank you, Sir, for coming and speaking to us today.

The meeting is adjourned (Applause)

"EMPIRE UNITY—THE BULWARK OF CIVILIZATION"

AN ADDRESS BY

BRIG.-GENERAL SIR HENRY PAGE CROFT, BART., C.M.G., M.P.

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Tuesday, August 30, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, our guest of honour at this special meeting of The Empire Club of Canada is Brigadier-General Sir Henry Page Croft, C.M.G., M.P., who has represented the constituency of Bournemouth in the British Parliament for 29 years. During Sir Henry's college days he was a noted oarsman. Twice he won the Thames Cup at Henley and for three years he rowed for his college. Immediately upon leaving college he entered politics and has been inspired with the ideal of a real brotherhood of nations within the British Empire. To this end he has worked tirelessly. Sir Henry believes that the present reciprocity of trade within the British Empire is not enough but there should be complete co-ordination; above all, co-ordination in purpose if the co-operation of the nations of the British Empire is to provide a practical solution for the present day perils in which we live.

During the war Sir Henry served with the 1st Battalion of the 1st Regiment. He was several times mentioned in despatches and was awarded the C.M.G. In 1916 he was promoted to the 16th Infantry Brigade, being then the youngest General in the British Army.

Sir Henry has chosen as his subject "Empire Unity—The Bulwark of Civilization." It is my privilege to introduce to you Brigadier-General Sir Henry Page Croft. (Applause)

SIR HENRY PAGE CROFT, *C.M.G., M.P.*: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I need hardly say that I regard it as a very great honour to be entertained as your guest here in Toronto today. It is one more proof, if such were necessary, of the great hospitality which any traveller from the Old Land always finds in your Dominion. I experienced the same kind of treatment 26 years ago and I see that you are still the same wonderful genial hosts.

Now I cannot address any Canadian gathering without asking the privilege of just telling all ex-service men in Canada that we old fighting men of the Old Country can never forget the great and decisive part which our kinsmen, the Canadian Expeditionary Force took on so many occasions when we had our backs to the wall. I wish good luck to the Canadian Legion, the Canadian Corps and the British Empire Service League which is not only, as I have discovered recently in my six thousand miles of travels, a wonderful organization, but which is a comradeship of valiant hearts which must be an asset to any great nation in the world and which I believe is appreciated as such by all your people throughout the Dominion. (Applause)

In 35 years of public life, 29 years of which I have had the privilege of sitting in the House of Commons, it is true, as some here know, that my principal aim has been to promote reciprocal trade as the shortest basis perhaps of Empire unity, and this unity was never more vital than today if our great fraternity of people is to take its part in leading civilization back to sanity, progress and prosperity. It is very many years since Canada first extended preferences to the products of Great Britain and in 1931-32 we won a great victory for that old cause, the cause of Joseph Chamberlain, when we were able to reciprocate what Canada had done so long and I venture to think that the fruits of that revolutionary change in British policy are far greater than most people imagine. Just think for one moment what this change of policy has done for Great Britain. For the last three years we have sold more manufactured goods to British countries than to the foreign world, and in the first six months of this year we sold a greater total of all goods and commodities of every description to the British Empire than to all foreign nations put together. (Applause) We sorely needed it because the economic nationalism of certain great states in the world was excluding our goods, so that some of our best customers of the past had turned into our fiercest competitors. Thus you will appreciate the fact that the preferment of British goods by all the various countries of the Empire under the Ottawa Agreement helped us to survive. Thank you for the part that you played in this respect.

But I find that even among some of the best informed Canadians there is not a complete conception as to the extent of the benefits which your country also has derived from the Ottawa Agreements. Permit me, therefore, if I may, to quote just one or two figures—more, I know, on an occasion like this would be unpardonable; it doesn't help the digestion. In 1932 Canada's exports of domestic produce to Great Britain totalled £178,000,000. In 1937, five years after the Ottawa Pact, you exported £404,000,000 worth of goods and commodities, or an increase of 125 per cent. This increase during five years of reciprocity I think you will agree is really remarkable and I, as an Englishman who has striven for this cause of economic partnership within the British Empire, am indeed proud of this story because, is it not convincing proof that reciprocity during these dark days of world depression must have saved many thousands of your primary producers from ruin, just as you and the other Dominions, the Crown Colonies and Protectorates who came under the Ottawa scheme have helped to keep the ship of state in the Old Country afloat in these same dark days?

The lesson, Mr. President, surely is that your strength is our strength, your prosperity and health means very much to us, your trials and sorrows are of deep concern to every British citizen and the same, I venture to hope and believe, is true, looking at the picture the other way around. Mr. President, independent as we are in free nationhood, yet we are vital to each other in the matter of our fortunes and, it may be a vulgar thing to say—I have said it once before since I have been in Canada—but I do suggest both from your point of view and ours, you should remember "where your treasure is there should your heart be also." So far we have been almost timid, we have almost apologized for making some contribution to each other's welfare. Can we not extend this policy of reciprocity by giving even more materially in all the things that matter, in trade, where possible, in shipping, in finance, in the use of capital, in development and in the flow of population?

I came to Canada on this occasion, after an unpardonable absence of 26 years, at the invitation of one of your provinces, British Columbia, in order to explore possibilities of developing and settling the western end of your great country and more especially the centre of that province running out to the Pacific Coast. We had a most wonderful and encouraging tour, and what is the good of a brother if he doesn't tell his brother what he thinks about it, even if it isn't always to the brother's credit. I hope Canadians will always be free in their expressions as to how we are going wrong in the Old Country and if I offer a suggestion I hope you will realize that it is only as a suggestion that comes from my heart and it is not meant as criticism. What is the practical lesson which hits us in the eye? It is, Sir, that without a greater flow of population Canada remains static and will have to continue to bear that immense burden of overheads in railways, roads, schools, telephones, public services and debt which clearly are intended for a far greater population. (Applause)

As an outsider who truly cares for Canada, such has been my Imperial upbringing, as much as I care for Scotland or Wales, or even Yorkshire, I cannot help wondering if your present troubles and travail are not due primarily to the complete cessation of immigration and the fact that new wealth consequently is no longer circulating through all the various wheels of your industry and agriculture. Frankly, I am such a believer in your country that I cannot believe that its destiny lies in this sub-continent with a population hardly bigger than that of Belgium. Sir, as a life-long student of economics I believe that trade follows population, as surely as night follows day, that capital follows trade and that mineral development and secondary industries are the components of the capital movement, and I would say to you, don't allow your tails to get down but continue to open up your country. You need capital and, above all, I believe most firmly that you need population and I would add just this: in this chaotic world when no man can rightly judge what is going to be the end of all things, I believe that the country which is most surely based upon a large population of mixed farmers will be the country which in the last test will survive the best.

Sir, I have a dream, so I have been told, but it is not a bad dream, and it is not an impossible dream. It is that we should once more see a flow, not an overwhelming flow, but a steady flow of our people of British blood coming to Canada. We in Great Britain are people that are cramped and congested, and I am afraid it is no exaggeration to say that at least one million men, and many of them with families, something like two or three million souls, can probably never hope to fine remunerative productive employment in the Old Land. I wonder, therefore, and I have only come to learn, not to lay down suggestions, I wonder whether, with the adventure, initiative and pioneering character of their fathers which is still in their blood—those fathers who hacked their way through the bush and who laid the foundation upon which you built your great nation—whether the sons of those fathers are not yet needed in considerable measure if you are to preserve the character, the tradition and the great spirit of your race. (Applause)

My conception is that backed by British credit, if the British Government can only be persuaded to get a move on, a great corporation should be formed not only to settle communities but to stand behind them and see them through to success. In other words, the success of such corporation would depend upon the success of the settlers. When speaking out West I suggested a plan of perhaps five years, of 10,000 settlers with their families coming into the wonderful areas which, as I have seen with my own eyes, are as yet almost untouched though undoubtedly of rich and fruitful soil.

I have found only one criticism which might appear at first to have some substance. That is, why bring more people into Canada when we have so many unemployed? Sir, the answer, in my opinion, is decisive. It would not aggravate unemployment but would tend greatly to help your unemployment problem. Let me in a brief moment or two explain what in my opinion must inevitably happen under such a settlement scheme. Take this example of 10,000 settlers. What are their requirements? They immediately want 10,000 houses, with also an immediate stimulus to the whole of the Canadian lumber industry. They would want under our scheme 20 acres per settler, cleared by Canadian labour—200,000 acres. They would want roadways to link up new farm districts with existing highways, requiring Canadian labour. They would want 20,000 horses, as a minimum, at once from Canadian ranches. They would want from 50,000 to 80,000 cows and cattle from Canadian stock raisers and 20,000 Canadian sows, not to mention 100,000 or 150,000 poultry, in order to start their chicken farms. That is the animal side of the picture.

What about secondary industry? They would want at once 20,000 agricultural machines as a start, and 40,000 in three years, and if I am not incorrect they would all come from Ontario, provided it was decided by that corporation, as it certainly should if Canadians are going to welcome the scheme, that those machines should all come from Canadian manufacturers, employing a large amount of Canadian labour. They would want stoves, pots and pans and all the other products of your secondary industry which are essential for the settler and for his wife in any modern civilization.

Mr. President, it has been estimated in my hearing -I don't know whether right or not—that every settled farmer in this country means $750 a year to the Canadian railways in traffic, etcetera. Well, it seems to me that $7,500,000 a year would not come amiss to your railways, even today. (Laughter) I believe no one who has really studied our plan, outside a mental institution, could contend that such a policy would aggravate unemployment. I believe such a policy would certainly be helpful to our people in the Old Country and would also be a Godsend to Canadian life, and the 25 to 30 million dollars which would be spent on the needs of such settlement, provided such a scheme were accepted by our government, would, in my candid opinion, go straight into Canadian pockets.

I said this is a dream, Sir, but already one province is almost aflame at the new hope and is ready through its Prime Minister to grant free land if the Federal and Imperial Government can find means for such a scheme coming into existence. Other provinces also have expressed great sympathy, and may we not hope, that your magnificent Province of Ontario will at least provide such ginger as is necessary in order to persuade the Federal Government to hold a Conference in order to explore the possibilities of such a scheme. (Applause)

Now, such a policy as this can, of course, only be carried with the support of all governments concerned. I would dearly love to go back to the Old Country and meet His Majesty's Ministers, with the help of that great fighter, Beverley Baxter (Applause) and say, "Now, what about it?" Baxter and I have voted £3,000,000 per annum for 18 years in order to settle and develop the British Empire and none of that money has been required. It has all gone back in the pot. If we could vote this in days gone by, I say has not the time come when development can start, when we shall extend the boons of capital advances to the British Dominions we were so ready to extend to Continental countries in the past in order, we hoped, to preserve the peace of the world, finally used and expended, I am afraid, in many cases in the building up of armaments which we now have to meet.

Now, Mr. President, why do I regard this question as urgent today in Great Britain? We have a surplus population, as I have mentioned, of magnificent people, but ten years hence we may have no surplus to spare. That is why I want to see something done this decade. Some foreigners, I am aware, are trying to insinuate to the world that Great Britain is on the down-grade. Don't believe it. Precisely the same old stuff is there. The land of so many of your forebears, the builders of early Canada is, I think I can tell you with absolute truth and sincerity, still foremost in the world and in spite of the drilled, regimented and organized competition of neighbouring states, Britain lives. Liberty is the breath of her nostrils, freedom is in her soul, and when ours, the highest taxed nation on earth, was suddenly confronted with a great peril staring her in the face because, no doubt with noble intention but perhaps lack of statecraft, we had almost disarmed to the bone, the British fleet was getting a very old lady, the Air Force which was first in the world at the end of the Great War had sunk to fifth place, we couldn't get recruits for the regular army, the territorial army was pathetic in its weakness. All these things had happened with the best intentions, but to show you that our spirit is not dead I would remind you that our nation—I think I can say our nation, for all parties except one, the then single Communist, are voting for defence estimates—decided to lay upon ourselves the unprecedented burden of £1,500,000,000 in order that we might be true to our trust and to the Empire as a whole, in order that we may help to defend civilization itself if it is truly necessary.

Mr. President, I think that mighty burden which we have undertaken, which we shall carry, some of us certainly to our graves, shows no sign of decadence, because we decided to do it almost without a groan. But in a country also which went through a phase when many of our pastors, masters and dons and professors were teaching the youth that the best way to avoid future war was simply to disarm, to stand there naked on the shores of Brighton and Bournemouth and Hastings, and the other seaside resorts and offer to be the batman of any invader if they were only good enough to land, and that would avoid war. I think that phase has gone by and although our forces were so miserably weak, I am glad to tell you, that the Royal Navy, which had become a rather proverbial thing as an old lady, in two years time will be worthy of Britain's place in the world, the finest fleet that sails the ocean. At the same time I am glad to be able to tell you that during the last twelve months we recruited more men for the services—the Royal Navy, the Air Force, the Territorial Army—than in any single twelve months when our country has been at peace in the past.

I just mention these litttle things to try to convince you, if I can, that we are not a lot of down-and-outs in the Old Country.

Now, Sir, I think you will agree that such efforts are worthy of your sister state. Under the wise, calm leadership of Neville Chamberlain, Britain is again proving worthy of her trust and believe me, toleration, patience, striving for peace is not weakness. The days of Palmerston when every petty insult was avenged by bombardment have gone by. Today the terrible instrument of war which might involve—and never forget this responsibility on the shoulders of our Prime Minister and Government—all our faithful kinsmen, that terrible instrument must only be used if all pacific means have failed. Please God they do not fail. Please God that should they fail we may still be worthy of our history and our past. (Loud applause)

Rest assured, Sir, however, of one thing, and that is that if one single inch of British territory, in whatever part of the world is assailed, we will spend our last man and our last shilling in its defence.

The collective ideal, to the grief of all sane people the world over, has broken down. Several of the greatest nations in the world stood outside with the result that most, I am afraid it must be said, all of the small nations are not prepared to take the risk of committing their nations to actual warfare on behalf of the collective ideal. The ideal remains and something may yet arise to bring the nations of the world to their senses in days to come, but admitted the ideal is a magnificent one, is it not yet possible to promote some form of collective security among that quarter of the world which lives under our common flag, collective in ideal, collective in thought and spirit and, as a last resort which we pray may never come, in defence? So it seems to me, if we are without definite commitments one to each other, if we are known to be absolutely united in the spiritual aims of our race we may yet keep peace through strength and unity, for after all, this wonderful collection of countries,—what we used to call an Empire and I don't mind the old word, personally, which some call the Commonwealth of British Nations, which is equally good, we all know what they mean—is perhaps the last great bulwark of peace, of freedom and of the right of a man to worship the God in whom he believes.

It seems to me when you observe the tendencies of other countries that we must admit we are happy indeed that the precious things of life are still to be found in every part of the British Empire. Let us realize what a menace it would be to the world if we were to weaken in our attachment or if we were to fall apart. Let us preserve that unity above all else, so that in the last resort if ever that time should come, this year, a hundred years or a thousand years hence, we may find these great people, born of liberty, which have given such great gifts to civilization, populating this great country and may we find in the last great fight of all the house may stand together, its pillars may not fall.

(Prolonged applause, followed by three cheers for Sir Henry Page Croft)

THE PRESIDENT: Sir Henry, I feel that it would be a waste of words for me to add anything to the applause and the cheers which have greeted your remarks. However, I cannot permit the meeting to close without thanking you most sincerely for your wonderfully inspiring address. To a Club whose motto is "Canada and a United Empire" it is particularly appropriate. (Applause)

"THE LAND SPEED RECORD"

An Address by CAPTAIN GEORGE E. T. EYSTON, M.C.

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, September 29, 1938

The President: Today, we have as our guest of honour, Captain George E. T. Eyston, M.C., an engineer, a lecturer and the holder of the world's land speed record. We are proud of the fact that he is British. We are thankful that thus far he has escaped permanent injury, although he does tell me he has bowled over a few telegraph poles and on one occasion had to "unload," when his machine was on fire and doing from sixty to seventy miles an hour.

Recently, Captain Eyston made a record on the Bonneville Flats in the State of Utah. He drove his car over the measured mile in 10.17 seconds, which is at the rate of 5.95 miles per minute and 357.5 miles per hour. At this rate of travel, Captain Eyston, if our highways permitted, could leave here and reach Oshawa in six minutes, Kingston in thirty minutes, and Montreal in fifty minutes.

Now, strange as it may seem, Captain Eyston's brother says that in traffic he is the most careful driver he ever saw and in fact is a snail.

I want to tell you something of the inconvenience the Captain has been put to in coming to speak to us. He promised last year that he would speak to The Empire Club but unfortunately he was taken ill and could not do so. This year I got in touch with him and he promised to come to Toronto if at all possible. To get here today he had to fly from Chicago leaving there last night at 12.30 and arriving at Buffalo this morning at five o'clock. He left Buffalo by air at ten o'clock and arrived here at eleven. That was so that he might keep his word to the Empire Club of Canada. Had the Captain been able to drive his "Thunderbolt" from Buffalo he would have arrived here in twenty minutes instead of the forty-five that it took to come by air.

Now, gentlemen, I might say we are not on the air today because of war news, but I would remind you of Captain Eyston's desire that you ask him any questions at the close of his address and he will answer them. I have, indeed, great pleasure in calling upon Captain Eyston to address our Club. Captain Eyston.

CAPTAIN GEORGE E. T. EYSTON, M.C.: Mr. President, Your Worship, His Reverence and Gentlemen: I am awfully glad to visit you today because, after all it is on the occasion of so very much better news, so far as the Empire is concerned. I always felt, having been through the last war from the start to the finish, that we couldn't possibly have another one, and I do think perhaps this is coming about, because it is inconceivable that people could be so silly these days; and it is really of historical importance, as you all know, that there can be such a momentous conference as is taking place today many thousands of miles away. I didn't come to talk to you about that but I couldn't help mentioning it.

The subject of my talk today is "The Land Speed Record"—the fastest ever travelled on land. It is a test of man and machine. To begin with the two runs have to be made in opposite directions and both of these runs have to be accomplished within a space of sixty minutes. This is the international rule governing this blue ribbon of records, the Land Speed Records.

Now you know this record is held at the present moment by the "Thunderbolt" which I planned and built and the present speed is 357.5 miles an hour or 575 kilometers an hour. The run in the northward direction was accomplished at 356.44 miles an hour and the run in the southward direction was made at 358.57 miles an hour. The difference in these speeds is attributable, I think, to the condition of the track at various points, but it is significant that the fastest speed record by the "Thunderbolt" this year on the memorable September 16 was 359.64 miles an hour—over the kilometer. That is, of course, in one direction, but it approximates to about one third of a mile short of 360 miles an hour which is the magic six miles a minute. It is only a hair's breadth, really, and a very small percentage of the whole and, as pronounced acceleration was noticeable on all runs through the measured distance on every occasion, it is certain the car did for a few seconds exceed a speed of six miles a minute which, of course, is another milestone in the history of motoring. I am very glad to have been able to accomplish this with a British car. (Applause)

You remember that this event took place, as your President said, on the Bonneville Salt Flats, in Utah, a very long distance from here. It is a fantastic sight to see this large field of gleaming salt stretched far between the mountains of Western Utah and Nevada. Only a small portion of this salt-bed can be used for motor car records for the rest is soft salt and mud. When we arrived in July the whole place was flooded to about ten inches and it took ages for the liquid, as I would call it, to evaporate, owing to it being salt brine. Then we had to wait until the water level dropped several inches below the surface before the beds were hard enough to run on. It is important that they should be very dry in order that the powerful motors in the car can have sufficient grip to hurl the huge mass of the machine forward at over 530 feet per second.

To give you an idea of what speed really means, my large 44-inch diameter tires were revolving at 45 revolutions per second. Imagine the very largest wheel you have ever seen on a huge commercial vehicle and picture what it means for it to revolve at 45 revolutions while you count one.

On the salt bed which has to be carefully prepared by dragging, we paint one or more black lines along the whole length. These lines act as guides and prevent the driver straying; for errors of a few feet in steering might culminate in disastrous results. You see, you might drive a few feet away from the absolute straight line, something else might happen and you get a few feet more and, believe me, you will never get back.

The car is brought out over night from our little village of Wendover and deposited with all our paraphernalia under a large marquee on the desert. On the day of the record run we get up at one o'clock in the morning and drive several miles out to the marquee in the desert and commence heating the oil for the engine and transmission, and bolt on our racing wheels (eight in number) and when daylight appears we hope that there will be conditions of no wind and, of course, no rain. Just after dawn the car is pushed to the start and then we have to see whether the time-keepers are ready. I have to shut myself in the cockpit by means of closing the roof and then adjust the fresh air mask which has saved me on very many occasions. This mask, I would explain, is connected up by a small tube about three-quarters of an inch in diameter leading to the nose of the machine and therefore, of course, you readily understand fresh air is always available no matter what is happening in the cockpit. With two engines of a couple of thousand horsepower each there might be a considerable volume of carbon monoxide which wouldn't give you a second chance.

When the word is given that the course is clear the car is pushed off by a truck just to get it on the move and then the huge motors roar out their message of immense power. The car literally disappears down the course in a cloud of black smoke, because, in order to keep the temperature down on engines giving so much power, it is necessary to run with the mixture very rich and the exhaust smoke trails out in a long stream as the machine shoots forward. Undoubtedly, when going full out there is a trail of perhaps three and a half miles of this black smoke. Second gear is changed for top just under two hundred miles an hour. The mile posts start passing as if you were "running the hundred yards" as we have large square boards indicating the number of miles from the start and the number of miles to pull up from the end of the measured distance. These boards are awfully important since you can soon lose track of where you are.

It must be remembered in connection with the "hundred yards" I have mentioned that the measured mile is covered in just over ten seconds. How many of you have run a hundred yards "in evens"? Well, the car does the mile in something like this or a trifle more. When going through the measured distance you are conscious of being encased in a projectile which nothing on earth will stop, and it is just a matter, really, of shooting through space. That is, of course, unless something happens! And it is that fear of this "something happening" which tends to add to the real thrill, never to be forgotten.

As the car passes by, you "see the object," and the sound follows about half a mile behind which is the real thrill given to the spectators.

When you have got over this measured distance there comes the anxious problem of pulling up, for only six miles ahead of you there is a road and a railway at right angles to the track. There is the end of all things and you must come to a standstill. So you shut down the engines, quite gingerly, and after a pause the air brakes are shot out. These project on either side of the car. Of course there is no possibility of testing them beforehand so it is really a great thrill the first time you put out the air brakes, at 320, wondering whether they are still in the machine or whether the tail is being torn off. Because, generally speaking, people even in aircraft do not put out brakes at 300 miles an hour! It is not yet possible to apply the mechanical brakes. Therefore, one rushes on and on—of course, far faster than ever experienced before because no one else has done it! Toward the spot where a halt must be called or otherwise disaster must result.

At last the time has come when the mechanical brakes can be applied to the full and their wonderful power saves the day. You have got to sit looking at the revolution counter falling and the distance diminishing to where you have got to halt and you hope your brakes are going to work!

To go on all through the business of breaking the record and the actual driving would be much too long and technical so I will just say this, that I am satisfied that Great Britain has put the land speed record where it will be difficult to beat by anyone outside the country. (Applause)

"Thunderbolt" has two Rolls Royce motors of 2,000 horsepower each which are geared together. The car is 35 feet long and weighs nearly seven tons. We tried the bold experiment of removing the stabilizing fin during the last run and it was very thrilling to see what would happen at these great speeds of over 350 miles an hour without the assistance of this fin to keep the car straight. All was well, however, and the reason of course for taking off this fin was to eliminate the extra drag as we thought that we could do a better speed without it.

The car was built in the works at Wolverhampton in England on a large table over which there was a huge crane. It was all accomplished in eight months, and well do I remember every day of it, since I hardly slept a wink. We got out to America in the late autumn of 1937 and took the Land Speed Record from "Bluebird" at 312 miles an hour and the fastest speed record last year was 319, which we thought was absolutely terrific!

Well I'm awfully glad to be permitted to address the members of the "Empire Club of Canada," and also those friends of the Dunlop Company and C. C. Wakefield, whose branches are out here and whose parent firm has helped me so much in this great record. I can't tell you, Mr. President, how much I value your looking after me and all the arrangements that have been absolutely superb. I am sorry that I didn't sleep last night—that was my fault. After the record there were many things I had to do, both business and otherwise and it has been necessary to resort to flying about.

As your President has said I shall be very glad indeed to answer any questions you may like to put to me, always reserving, of course, the right to refuse to answer those I don't like! You might like to know something particular about the car and its performance and what we did.

In conclusion may I say again how splendid it is to be with you here. It is the first time I have been in Canada. I have been very close many times but it was literally impossible to make it. I do hope that the international situation will clear up and that we shall go to our beds tonight with the assurance that for some time to come at any rate the sky will be clear, because I think we all have one common aim and that is peace. If people don't want peace, let them stand back, because as far as I know, a war today, as it will be, will only lead to complete misery, and everybody knows this, so we hope it will be averted.

May I thank you all for bearing with me all this time. I hope I have succeeded in interesting you and may I wish you all "the very best."

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure we have all listened to Captain Eyston with a great deal of admiration — admiration of his skill, of his iron nerve, and of his modesty.

On the way in I was asked if I would ask Captain Eyston to tell us what effect driving the measured mile northward and the measured mile southward and the subsequent few miles before he may be liable to strike disaster, had on his physical condition and also upon his nerves? Is that one of the questions you prefer not to answer?

CAPTAIN EYSTON: I don't mind at all. I would certainly like to answer your questions. As far as physical condition is concerned, of course, it is necessary to go into a certain amount of training. It isn't a long distance event, but at the same time one does abstain from drinking and smoking to as great a degree as possible and you must go into this—I am back on this record—with all the wits you can muster. As regards the strain imposed on the mind I think that is far greater than the physical strain. The machine is sometimes difficult to control. The gear shift, the clutch and the brake are all very stiff and it requires all one's strength to operate the machine. Therefore, one has to build oneself up to be sufficiently strong to accomplish this.

As regards the strain in the event, the harassing part is having to stop at the far end and wait while the wheels are being changed and check up the car generally just to see that nothing is broken. This has to be done in a tremendous hurry and the car has to be torn more or less to pieces to get the wheels off and on again, all in the space of twenty-five minutes, and there is the anxiety that there has been something missed out. The best part is when it is all over!

THE PRESIDENT: Now, gentlemen, the floor is yours. You have the Captain at your mercy. I hope you are not going to be backward. The Captain, I have found from my short association with him, is a charming man and I asked him—I was going to say hundreds but it is more like a thousand questions—coming down from the air field this morning, so he knows what to expect from Canadians.

MR. WARREN B. HASTINGS: How should a car be handled by the driver when it goes at cruising speed on the road, and when the driver enters a curve and realizes that the car is becoming unstable—what should he do? If he goes into a curve too fast or a tire bursts what should he do?

CAPTAIN EYSTON: First, I would suggest that the owner of the car purchase tires that don't burst! But it is a very difficult thing with one wheel on the rim when taking a curve because there is a tremendous drag accruing from that and you simply can't get away from it. Low geared steering would help tremendously, in being able to get a mechanical advantage in turning the wheel which is so sticky, but the fact that the car heels over adds to the difficulties. The best thing is to go straight on. Just as when anything happens in an aeroplane when you are taking off and the motor stops. The thing is to go straight on. It doesn't matter whether there is a brick wall or anything else, the best thing is always to go straight on. That is what I recommend if anything happens on a curve when you are in trouble.

QUESTION: May I ask what was the petrol consumption at the greatest speed reached?

Captain Eyston: At the maximum speed it was consuming about one gallon a mile.

Mr. Harrison Smith: I want to ask a question. What kind of gas did you use?

Captain Eyston: Entirely out of order. (Laughter)

Mr. Miles: I would like to ask just how gingerly the Captain takes his foot off the accelerator after the measured mile.

Captain Eyston: As you will appreciate when it is covering a mile at the rate of just over 10 seconds you must be very quick about the business of closing the throttle; otherwise too much ground is covered. At the same time it is impossible to slam the throttle close because of the reversal stresses, but it is essential to draw it back slowly and make sure it is really closed. That would be a tremendous danger if, by accident, the throttle wasn't more or less completely closed because you want the full braking power of the engine. Should it be opened ever so slightly, then you have made a miscalculation.

Question: What is the construction and performance of the tire?

Captain Eyston: All the tires are made at Fort Dunlop in Birmingham, England, and they are sent over in cases, some mounted on wheels. All tires are hand made. There is very little rubber, about a millimeter, but it is a very remarkable fact that even going 10 or 12 miles at a speed, 50% of which is at maximum speed, the rubber has hardly been abraded at all.

With regard to the performance of the tires it is quite obvious that these tires have to be tested on special machines at the factory, driven by electric motors on rollers and loaded to capacity which they will be required to undertake on the actual record. All these tests are made until a perfect article is produced.

Mayor Ralph Day: Mr. President, it is said when a golf club hits a ball (when it is driven by the President of this Club), it becomes a sphere and is no longer round. I wonder whether that tremendous centrifugal force enlarges the tire.

CAPTAIN EYSTON: Yes, it is bound to enlarge the tire and the casing will be deformed quite appreciably and assume another shape. All the time it is called upon to flex because, if you will realize, the wheel is revolving at 45 revolutions while you count one and there are certain reflexes the tire has to perform. It is truly remarkable that it can do anything of the sort and transmit 1,000 horsepower at the same time.

MR. F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH, K.C.: I would like to say I had the pleasure or whatever you call it, of driving the first car in Canada. Our speed was 12 miles an hour. It has rather increased I see by what the speaker has said. There has been a very great increase from 12 miles an hour to 357. I think it shows a rather big advance.

CAPTAIN EYSTON: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. L. CRAWFORD BROWN: Mr. Chairman, several years ago when the late Sir Henry Seagrave made his record, and on the occasion when he failed to stop it was found that his brake linings were molten metal on the wheels. This has obviously been eliminated. What effect has the run and the braking on the brake linings?

CAPTAIN EYSTON: I understand in the past burning has taken place — the linings have been completely changed and further the brakes were rendered absolutely useless by heat. All this has been gone into most thoroughly during the course of the last few years. The brakes on my car are especially designed for the purpose. They are disk brakes which automatically cool themselves with the result that I have twice the braking area of a normal brake and the linings are in first-class condition at the finish.

MR. FRASER: Mr. President, may I ask a question? I was in the army the same as Captain Eyston. The Captain said that the greatest thrill that the spectators had was in seeing the car half a mile ahead of the sound —would the Captain explain to us what was the thrill he had?

CAPTAIN EYSTON: The greatest thrill I had was when I finished the record.

MR. WARREN B. HASTINGS: What is the potential speed of "Thunderbolt" as computed by Captain Eyston and what is the topmost land speed in his opinion?

CAPTAIN EYSTON: Well, both these questions are difficult to answer. It is purely a matter of conjecture, and I think the less said the better. So far as "Thunderbolt" is concerned it certainly could go faster.

With regard to the maximum possible on land I think a tremendous amount of development work will have to be done to reach 400 miles an hour. Certainly we are quite a long way off yet. I think we will have to be content with six miles a minute.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, our time is up. You have heard enough from the President for one day. His Worship, the Mayor, has very kindly said that he will extend your thanks to Captain Eyston.

MAYOR RALPH DAY: Mr. President, Captain Eyston and Gentlemen: When we were informed at the City Hall a few days ago that Captain Eyston would be here to speak to the Empire Club, it was our pleasure to immediately make some arrangement for a civic reception at the City Hall. It is only because of the fact that the Captain is spending such a very short time in Toronto and Canada that those arrangements have not been filled. I therefore take very much pleasure on behalf of the members of this Club present and on behalf of my fellow citizens of the City of Toronto of welcoming him to Toronto, of wishing him continued success, and expressing the most earnest wish that we will see him again next year if not earlier, at which time I think he will, unquestionably, be here to talk of 357 miles an hour as a record made in the past and not the record then standing.

Sir, we do very, very much appreciate that out of an extremely busy life you have found time to come to Toronto to address this meeting and on behalf of the members of this Club and my fellow citizens it is my duty as well as my very great pleasure to thank you. (Applause)

"THE THEATRE AS WE KNOW IT"

AN ADDRESS BY SIR CEDRIC HARDWICKE

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, October 13, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: Sir Cedric, Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada: So well known is our guest of honour today that probably an announcement of his name would be sufficient introduction to any English-speaking audience. Sir Cedric is the youngest man to have been knighted for his contribution to the stage, but he is not young in experience or in the tradition of the theatre. At the age of twelve he had planned with some young friends to see Sir Henry Irving, who was to appear in a theatre in a near-by town in The Merchant of Venice. When he failed to see the play because of the demise of Sir Henry, he suggested to his friends that they, themselves, should attempt a performance of the Shakespearian drama. Sir Cedric chose for himself the rôle of Antonio. Thus a star was born.

Whenever he played hookey from the boarding school he attended, and I understand his record in this phase of his school life compared very favourably with that of other boys, he was usually found at the theatre, helping the stage hands or helping at the rehearsals.

So the boy whose parents wanted him to become a doctor where his field would have been so limited, has become a famous actor and has extended British culture throughout the whole civilized world.

We are delighted to again welcome Sir Cedric Hardwicke who has chosen as his subject, "The Theatre as We Know It." Sir Cedric. (Applause)

SIR CEDRIC HARDWICKE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Empire Club of Canada: You see before you an actor in a most unfortunate predicament. To begin with I had the pleasure of addressing this Club some eighteen months ago and every time I appear in a town I am always certain it will be for the last time. I have one good speech which I got off the last time I was here and I find myself faced with the prospect of having to speak to you for a considerable time and to refrain, as far as I am able, from covering the same ground. In the first place I must thank you very much for the compliment of wanting to listen to me a second time.

Before I proceed further I want to correct the opening remarks of your President in his reference to my being well known. I thought I was, rather, but only last week in one of the papers I happened to run across one of those strange competitions known as Knowledge Tests. The first was: What is the foreign policy of the Moabites? The second question was: Can you give a rough idea of the Einstein theory? and the third was: Who is Sir Cedric Hardwicke? This very effectively killed the illusion that my name was a household word.

Now I am committed to speak to you on the subject that has the title, "The Theatre as We Know It," which is very alarming, because I am never able to speak long on any one subject without switching over to a thousand others. It doesn't mean that at all, it means, "The Theatre As I Know It." Perhaps having myself a mind which has only one track, which is a theatre mind, I am inclined to consider the theatre of greater importance than it really is. As I say, and as our President has reminded you, and reminded me, too, since the time I played truant and ran away to the little wooden theatre where very crude plays were given by bad actors, and very crude performances of some of the plays of Shakespeare were given, the theatre has always been to me the aim and object of my life. I have been in theatre twenty-five years and during that time I have seen many changes. I have seen it cease to be, as it used to be, an important thing in the town.

The second day I was in Toronto I was walking down the street and I met a very old friend of mine who had been in the army with me. He said, "Good Heavens, what are you doing in Toronto?" I said, I am acting at the theatre." He said, "Where is the theatre?" This, to me, especially after the Knowledge Test, was another very, very severe shock.

Now, I should like to bear tribute to the press of this town because I have had considerable pleasure from reading the papers, but there is one plea I would like to make to the press, not only of this town but of all towns, where the theatre is concerned. That is, not to worry about my views on acting or the value of tooth paste, or really on the recent crisis in Europe, which is of no value at all, but to give a little more space for my play. What I mean is this: In this town this week—I have been really favoured, I have never been the victim of so much hospitality—so few people display the slightest interest in the only thing I can do with any efficiency, that is, act in the theatre.

The last time I made a speech of this kind I made it my business to find out how many had seen my play. I found, roughly, about two per cent.

My views on the European crisis have been sought by many eminent people in this town. They are of no value whatsoever. I am not quite so sure that my views on the theatre as a whole are of great value because I am an actor, and the only subject on which an actor can speak with any sort of enthusiasm is himself.

Now, the only reason I am making this preamble is to make the point that quite definitely the theatre is not as important or of as much interest to you as it is to me.

Now, we say perhaps there is no necessity for a theatre. There is plenty of entertainment; there are many first class motion picture houses; every house has a radio. Why should we worry about a theatre? I say you should worry about a theatre for this reason: A city that has no theatre has no temple, if I may use the word, dedicated to the human graces. You know a great many people complain that they cannot hear actors in the theatre. That is largely because the art of speaking is being neglected. What is more, it is not only the art of speaking that is being neglected, but also the art of hearing, because the impact of sound on the human being is such that very soon we shall not be able to speak without the assistance of microphones and shall not be able to listen without the assistance of loud speakers. The theatre is the only building left now where the human voice is used without amplification of sound and where the audience can exercise their once frequent habit of listening carefully. Ears have been ruined and wrecked by amplification of sound. To me it was appalling to be back walking about the streets of New York and hear Mr. Hitler's speech being poured at me from taxicabs and drug stores everywhere I went, great volumes of sound blaring into my ears at every corner. I realized that a long subjection to that would result in the ear losing all subtlety and being unable to pick up the more delicate inflections of the human voice and certain aspects of speaking that represent its real culture and the human voice at its best.

Now, given no theatre, it is pretty obvious we are not going to develop these graces. It seems to me unless we have the theatre—when I say the theatre, I mean the best theatre, a theatre dedicated to keeping alive some of the graces and the most wonderful dramatic literature that the world has ever known—we will find that there is no development of these graces. We, who are fortunate to speak the English language, have a wonderful store house of dramatic literature. Shakespeare is recognized in every country and every language, not only as one of the greatest dramatists or playwrights, but one of the greatest masters of the English language, and one of our greatest and most beautiful philosophers. Are we going to lose this? Are we going to let it decay on the book shelves, or are we going to keep these wonderful speeches alive by acting and displaying the human graces at their best?

The theatre will encourage us to set standards in speaking, in gesture and in movement, and in walking. The drama, of course, incorporates dancing, the art of pantomime, all those things that are going to offset the terrible impact of mechanism on the human frame. We are going to have it, and no indifference on your part toward the theatre and no indifference on the part of the great masses toward the theatre is going to stop this automatic swing back to the simple things, the things that really matter.

In England now, I can assure you, that, whereas five or six years ago the roads were crowded with motor cars, they are now crowded with young people walking or riding bicycles, which they must do, otherwise they will cease to walk. I am going on a side track for a moment. I was so concerned in New York, where I have been for the last eight months, by the fact that scientific heating in the winter and scientific cooling in the summer are making people completely incapable now of going out on the street at all.

What are we going to do about this? I do feel most deeply that we must try and do something to get back some of the simple graces, some of the things that really matter to us, and to discard some of the false values that have been set in the way. Acting and the theatre, I think, do help in a modest way; I think in a great way —I am speaking for your benefit; it does help me in a modest way to get back an appreciation of the human graces.

Now, let us consider how the theatre has changed and altered from the time I played hookey—is that the word?—or truant from school, paid my shilling and sat in the gallery of the theatre. That was some thirty or thirty-five years ago and we all, at least a great many of us, remember what the world was like in those days. To begin with, the streets were very poorly lighted. We had gas lights and to see a bright light was real excitement, a real event. Our families were presided over by very austere fathers who exercised so much discipline that we almost felt it was a liberty going to the theatre. There was a certain freedom that we never had at home. A spice was given to going to the theatre because it was regarded as something disreputable.

Let us make a sudden quick and rapid jump to today. We find instead of actors as in those days going around with long hair and high collars, going around addressing the Empire Club of Canada and welcomed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. In fact, we have all become very, very respectable. Apart from that, the theatre rather than being something to be ashamed of is the last word in culture, it is the thing to do now. In Broadway many of us go into the theatre to rest our eyes from the bright lights. Not only that, we find the theatre is so quiet, it is a sort of intellectual retreat. We find more make-up in the stalls than we do now on the stage. In other words, we find that life has moved from the austerity of the Victorian scene to the brilliant, dramatic, colourful world that we live in today. What theatre can hope to give you the drama of the last few weeks? How can I as an actor, compete with some of the magnificent performances put on recently in the political field, and in the international field? I do not pretend to have the drama of some of the military dictator rulers. I don't wish to become involved in politics—I don't know anything about it. I do cast an eye to the Continent with a certain appreciation of the theatrical efficiency with which things are conducted there and I would not ask anybody to come to the Royal Alexandra Theatre this week hoping to see anything that would give them more dramatic satisfaction or more colour than they can get from the life of today.

And our newspapers—when I was a boy if I wanted to read about an exciting murder, I had to buy a little pink paper called the Police Times. If we wanted to see a real, cold-blooded crime, we had to go to the local "Blood Club" as the theatre was called and enjoy ourselves with Maria Martin in "The Murder in the Bedroom." Now we can get all the satisfaction we require regarding our interest in crime from the front page of the most respectable papers in the world. The London Times now, with all its dignity, has far more drama, shall I say, than most of the theatres. We have become a sort of retreat from life. That is a very significant change, because it has had its effect upon the type of plays that we do, and it has certainly had its effect on, shall we say, on the type of people who now come to the theatre.

In the thirty years which has been thirty years of great adventure for me, we have seen the impact of the mechanical entertainment on the theatre. The growth of the motion picture and of the radio and the prospect now in the near future of television, and we say to ourselves, "How are we going to live? How are we going to compete with these new forms of entertainment that rise so rapidly and that go through their evolution with so much efficiency?" These new forms of entertainment are able to reach every home and an audience can for a few cents sit in a temple such as Solomon would have built years ago and wallow in luxury that, when I was a boy, was known only to kings and queens. I mean, for a few cents you can go into a building now that we really never saw when you and I were children. Now, what is going to be the effect of this? Do people, in the first place, for a long time really like things that are cheap and comfortable and easy? Isn't there a sort of resistance to it and don't you after a time become rather tired of it? I think the human being is so constituted that after a while he likes to do the thing that is more difficult and I am not sure that we shan't reach a time when the harder it is to go to a theatre and the harder the seats are, the more we will have coming. There will be a sense of achievement in having seen a play. You know people come to me and say very much as they might have said, "I flew an aeroplane single-handed across the Atlantic last night," "I saw your play last night" — a very great sense of achievement. For $25.00 they sat in a very uncomfortable seat, they couldn't see and hear very well, but they got a little martyrdom that rather pleased them. In fact, they are much more pleased with themselves than with my performance. So perhaps we are arriving at a stage where people are sated with luxury and ease.

After all is said and done, the radio is a very wonderful thing and we were never more conscious of that fact than during the crisis we have recently passed through when it brought directly to our homes everything that was happening right from its source. In fact, as somebody said to me the other day, "We got it straight from the horse's mouth." That is a very wonderful thing. But, of course, you must remember that the radio is still a novelty and the time will come when the radio programme will have to be of superlative quality in order to retain its interest. You know, when I was a boy, when we first had electric light in the home, we were turning it on and off the whole time. We thought it was a wonderful thing. Very soon we only turned it on when we thought it was necessary.

This brings us to the particular point about the theatre: whatever its short-comings may be, it is still an occasion to dress and to go to the theatre, it is, and always has been an occasion. It is a social occasion, it is a night you remember. You may pay more for your seat, but if you ever saw Henry Irving in The Merchant of Venice, whatever you paid for your seat was well worth the money, because it has lasted you for forty years. You can't say that about any cinema show you ever saw, however good it may have been, because going to the pictures is not an occasion. If I may make very bad comparisons, and generalities, of the difference between the motion pictures and the theatre, it is largely the difference between newspapers and books. We couldn't do without our newspapers. They are vital, they are essential. At the same time, sometimes we like to have leisure with a book and put it on the shelves and keep it and treasure it, because it has something about it, an air of permanence. Yesterday's edition of the greatest newspaper you know, even of the Globe and Mail, no one would say was of very great value.

I also venture to think that last week's gigantic, colossal, magnificent, super-motion picture, is of very little value, because it is replaced this week by something more colossal, more magnificent and more superior. Listening to the radio, or reading a newspaper, is something that has little permanence. Somehow the theatre, even though art is supposed to be transient, does seem to give something that has permanence. I don't know whether it is the traditions that surround the great actors of the past—Garrick, Kean, and then Irving, who is only now becoming rather a legend, but who is more distinct than almost anybody and certainly his work still has the grandeur that it was given during his lifetime. Now there is many a painter who has enjoyed success in his life, who doesn't represent so much to us because we are able to judge his work. These people live by tradition. People hand on to their sons and daughters stories of the prowess and might of those great actors. Nobody disputes it. What is going to happen today? I don't pretend that I am a competitor for posterity, but if I ever should be, in order to completely disprove any legend handed down, they will drag out some awful moving picture I made some years ago and see for themselves how bad I was. There it is.

The theatre in spite of its very transient nature, did seem to have somewhere about it the germ of permanence. I think that is very largely because the great actors of the past were associated with great casts in plays, which, of course, live for all time.

Well, these are the changes that we have seen, or that I have seen, shall I say, in the theatre since I was a boy. Now we come to the important point that although it has changed enormously, although we agree it has lost perhaps its significance to the masses, it is still desirable to keep it alive. Is it worth preserving, or shall we let it die? Well, I can only put this plea to you; the art of the theatre at its best is the only really imaginative entertainment that is left. The theatre is the only thing that deals exclusively with human beings, their feelings, their emotions, their passions, their likes, their dislikes, their comedies, their tragedies and deals with them with you.

By that I mean that you take part actually yourself, by your presence, in a play. You take part in the play that is being performed. Why do we make so many ghastly mistakes about plays? Why do we have dress rehearsals? Why do we ring the curtain up on the first night on a dreadful, appalling entertainment that is kicked off the boards in the first three days? We do this because we are reckoning without the most important members of the company, which is the audience. The word "play," I think, means what it says, that it is a game. When the curtain goes up—it goes up every night at half past eight at the Royal Alexandra Theatre, there are lots of seats left,—we say to you as actors, "Now, look, we are going to play a little game. This very charming actress is my little serving maid. I am going to pretend that I am a man of considerable culture,"—which, as you can see, requires a good deal of pretence. "Will you play the game with me?" The audience, having paid a considerable sum of money to come in, is quite willing to play the game as long as the play is a success. If half-way through the first act, the audience says, "I don't like the game, I don't think I will play any longer," then you have a failure. This, of course, is the important thing. It means that you are part of the art that you patronize. It is your own materials, just as much as the brush and the paint are the materials of the artist or the painter, and opinions are the material of the writer. It is with you we play. There is no take it or leave it attitude about the actor or the playwright toward his public as there is about the other arts. A man creates a piece of sculpture, paints a picture, writes a book, and when it is done it is there. You take it or leave it if you don't like it. He can't help it, he can't do anything about it. We are not like that. We are plastic when you are with us playing a game. You don't watch in that detached, impersonal way, you act as part of the acts of the play.

Go back to Shakespeare and you find that the actors deliberately came down and confided to the audience. They came down and said, "I am thinking this," or, "I am thinking that." They went into the secret chambers of the acting minds and shared all their feelings about the situations of the play. When I was a child, the hero or the villain would come down and say, "You watch me slap him on the jaw." It was good fun because the audience was part of it. Of course, the theatre buildings then were of such a nature, the architecture was such that the audience naturally blended into the play. The galleries were horseshoe shaped and you could hardly tell where the audience ended and the play began. In fact, the old stage boxes in those days were actually on the stage. If a man got very upset with the villain he could step out of his box and sock him on the jaw. That is the point. In those days they realized the necessity of one powerful quality the theatre had of making the play a personal experience to the play-goer. I rather deplore the tendency we have now to get away from that and to think of the audience as detached spectators, as in a moving picture house.

You couldn't co-operate with the moving pictures. You sit in a theatre and the leading lady smiles beautifully. You have a sort of feeling she is smiling for you, which, indeed, she is. When you see the most beautiful screen actress smile, you have the appalling feeling that she is doing the same thing in Singapore and Hong Kong and for the natives of Honolulu. About the theatre there is this personal thing. This something—your imagination begins to take fire and we work together and that must make an experience that is worth while and one, I think, which is important, because it calls once more into use this neglected imagination.

Now, in the theatre, we are realizing more and more that we have to retreat against other forms of entertainment in order to survive. We are falling back more and more upon the imagination. The real theatre, the theatre that I love and have always loved, is the theatre best described as three boards and a box. Great actors and great writers combine together to create something which will set your imagination on fire and let you do the work. Shakespeare's works were performed on a bare stage with no scenery, every second or third line devoted to explaining the surroundings—"Here on this island"; "I know a bank where the wild thyme grows"; "Here on the Rialto." The play is written to try to set your imagination alive, to make you work.

Then we retreated from that and we had a very realistic theatre. Because we had to be realistic we had to stay indoors, because the painters couldn't paint trees as realistic as walls and doors, and so for years the theatre was indoors. We were in our drawing room smoking cigarettes and our behaviour had to be as real as a three dimensional door. We were getting away from the essentials of the theatre, which is the game.

What do we find happening in New York this season? We find they are producing plays on the bare stage. The hit of the season was a play called "Our Town" in which the actors wore their street clothes and there was no scenery. The play was written and acted in such a way that the people saw that town more clearly, more plainly, in their imagination than any scene painters or directors could ever have given you in a realistic play.

Then we saw another success—Mr. Orson Welles's production of Julius Caesar on the bare stage. If any of you saw it, you realize how effective and moving it was. Of course the truth is when people say the theatre hasn't the scope of the cinema, they are just talking nonsense. The theatre had limitations while it was trying to be real, trying to show the real thing. As long as it depends on the imagination and upon writing and acting and makes you use your imagination, it has no limitations at all. Shakespeare could show you everything from Venice to Belmont, to Scotland, to the Scottish moors and the woods in Athens. He had no limitations because he didn't impose any upon himself. His realm is the world of your imagination and provided we can get back to plays, to great writing, great acting, that depends more upon their implications than their statements, that will make you think, make you do the work, then we are going to have a theatre and it seems to me it is going to justify the importance I place upon it and which I am sorry to say I don't really think any of you do.

There are so many things I could say about the theatre. I could talk about the theatre from now until tomorrow morning. There are so many things I know I have missed. I am so conscious of the fact that perhaps enthusiasm on my part has replaced logic, has replaced considered opinions and judgment and certainly wit. I would wish that I had more time to prepare an address that had a real beginning and a middle and an end and that arrives at some conclusion, but I must ask your pardon because this week has been a very, very heavy one. Toronto is the most hospitable place in the world. I have been entertained by everybody and I am afraid on occasions like this, I make a very poor return for the hospitality. You know we actors have no business to be doing this at all. We should be hiring really clever lecturers, propagandists, people who can present our case with a good deal more clarity and more fairness than an actor can. We shouldn't be seen until the evening. Actors and burglars work best at night. You have seen me at great disadvantage. You see a bald headed gentleman standing before you. You should see me in the theatre,—I have the most beautiful hair. My grease paint will give me something I could do with here very, very nicely.

I'm only saying this to you in the hopes that my few remarks have made out some sort of case for the continued use and support of the theatre and have not been a handicap. I leave you with my most grateful thanks for having listened to me so carefully and my earnest hope that you will give to the theatre all the support you think it deserves, not more, and that you will start giving your support this week. You have only three days left.

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: Sir Cedric, the close attention with which you have been followed, speaks for itself, but I cannot permit the meeting to close without expressing the thanks of the Empire Club of Canada to you, Sir, for having so graciously consented to speak to us again. If your speech in 1937 was your best, may I be permitted to say, that the life of an actor must be a great life, because undoubtedly after having read your speech of last year, as I did last night, I think that the one you have delivered today at least equals it.

On behalf of the members of our Club present, and on behalf of the great audience that has listened to you over the air, I thank you most graciously.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Applause)

"BRITAIN IN INDIA"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR FIROZKHAN NOON, K.C.I.E., M.A. (Oxon.)

Tuesday, October 18, 1938.

A joint meeting of the Canadian Club and the Empire Club of Canada was held on Tuesday, October 18, 1938, at which the guest-speaker was Sir Firozkhan Noon, K.C.I.E., M.A. (Oxon.) The meeting was presided over by Mr. D. M. Gowdy, Vice-President of The Canadian Club.

MR. D. M. GOWDY: Gentlemen, before we go on the air it is a very great privilege to have a few words from Major Ney, Executive Secretary of the National Council of Education, under which body our guest-speaker is travelling today. Major Ney.

MAJOR NEY: Your Honour, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Attorney-General: The visit of Sir Firozkhan Noon has as its background that great rally of youth representing every country of the Empire, which was held in the Royal Albert Hall on May 18th, in connection with the Coronation. Many of you may not know that that gathering, together with the services in Westminster Abbey, in Westminster Cathedral for Roman Catholics, and in the Central Synagogue for Jewish youth, on the following day, were all organized by the National Council of Education.

At the evening rally in the Albert Hall your guest today was one of the speakers who spoke on behalf of different parts of the Empire. He received a reception from our young people which was second only to that received by Mr. Baldwin himself.

Now, The Times, referring to that gathering on the following day, said this. After describing this gathering of youth, nearly 10,000 in number, The Times went on to say: "To them the Duke of Gloucester brought the message from the King, and in words as simple as true described the Empire as a great partnership, doing things together for the common good. This partnership is based very largely upon friendship. Pride of Empire he conveyed as pride in its power for good in the world and also for peace."

Then, The Times goes on to say: "When Mr. Baldwin's turn came he spoke as one handing on to another generation the task of government which unfolds in varying forms from one age to the next." This is quoting Mr. Baldwin: "I have had my hour. I pass soon into the shade but as for you, your life lies before you. In the next quarter of a century, as you come to play your part in the great world, the great problems will be problems of government. We vest in you the duty of guarding what is worthy and worth while in your past and our heritage and our traditions. You are in charge of our honour and of all our hopes."

The Times then goes on to say: "There is a great variety of youth movements in the world. Political parties are seeking to involve the groups and sectarian movements. States administered on totalitarian principles are bringing up their youths in rigid drilling of minds and bodies, with a stultifying uniformity. The youth movements that suit our British temper must be those that safeguard youth, its freedom, its originality and its enterprise, both in the realm of the spirit and in the realm of affairs, and inculcates the works of social service with a single motive of enriching and uplifting the level of human happiness and well being."

The Times then goes on quoting Mr. Baldwin as saying that it is a memorable occasion when all must realize the duty and the grandeur of the responsibility that rests on the citizens of a free country. The rich inheritance of the past is a trust to be held for future generations and not the least valuable part of this inheritance is our democracy, crying to the youth of the day for the leadership of the next generation, leadership that might go forward or backward.

Mr. Baldwin spoke of peace and preparation for war and glorification of war as an ideal and affirmed that as long as the British Empire lasts we shall raise our voices against these false gods.

Also in the speech, in its finest phrases, was the characteristic proclamation of a pertinent faith in freedom, the sanctity of personality and the brotherhood of man, which implies the Fatherhood of God. "The brotherhood of man today," he said, "is often denied and derided and called foolishness, but it is in fact one of the foolish things of the world with which God has chosen to confound the wise and the world is confronted by it daily. We may avoid it, we may deny it, but we shall find no rest for our souls, nor for the world, until we acknowledge it as the ultimate wisdom."

That, Gentlemen, was on an occasion when we laid the foundations of an Empire Youth Movement. Since then definite strides have been made. I haven't time to tell you anything about it, except one particular item which I hope will interest everyone here today. Last year we brought to Canada a group of British boys and a group of New Zealand boys. They went into camp together with another group of Canadian boys at Banff. It was such a great success that we have decided to set up there a permanent camp to which the boys of western and eastern Canada may come as time and occasion permits, and where the youth of the Empire can gather and as time goes on one hopes the youth of the world, where they may learn something of our essential love of freedom and of the friendliness which is characteristic of our people. That camp we hope can take the form of, shall I say, an acknowledgment of the great service which Mr. Chamberlain has just rendered the youth of the Empire in preserving peace.

My time is up and I can only say, in conclusion, when the time comes to press forward for the inauguration of that camp, to be known, I hope, as the King's Camp, at Banff, I hope that all of you here today will lend it your aid and your enthusiasm.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Applause)

Mr. D. M. Gowdy: Thank you very much, Major Ney.

Your Honour and Gentlemen: Today we are holding a joint meeting of The Canadian Club and The

Empire Club, and it is our privilege to welcome as guest-speaker, Sir Firozkhan Noon, who will address us on a very important subject, "Britain in India."

Unfortunately, the President of The Canadian Club, Mr. Victor Smith, could not be present, but he sent a special message which I would like to read to you on this occasion:

"The occasions when we are afforded the opportunity to welcome visitors from our sister members of the British Commonwealth of Nations are all too few. As members of this great family we naturally have much in common and we should see more of each other. But even with today's advanced means of travel our boundaries are still too widely separated to permit of that free intermingling of our peoples which so promotes knowledge and understanding of each other. It therefore gives us the greatest pleasure when we are able to greet citizens of India when they visit our shores and, particularly, when they come, as does Sir Firozkhan Noon, as leaders of their country, and a representative of a civilization thousands of centuries old bringing a message of goodwill to the citizens of Canada."

A few details concerning our guest-speaker would be in order, particularly for our invisible audience on the air. Sir Firozkhan Noon took his degree in history at Oxford University and proceeded with his legal training at the Inner Temple, London. Shortly afterward he proceeded to India to practise his profession. At a very early age he was elected to the Punjab Legislative Council, where he remained as a member for some sixteen years. He resigned that body to become High Commissioner for India in England. Gentlemen, he is the youngest High Commissioner ever to represent India in England, and besides his office as High Commissioner he acts on Imperial and International bodies for India.

Sir Firozkhan is the guest of the National Council of Education and since his arrival here one month ago he has travelled this Dominion from coast to coast. We feel that his has been a notable contribution toward interpreting India in Canada, and we hope that as he returns shortly to his post, that we may have served our part in interpreting Canada to India.

Your Honour, and Gentlemen, I present to you Sir Firozkhan Noon. (Applause)

Sir Firozkhan Noon, K.C.I.E., M.A.: Your Honour, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Conant and Gentlemen: First of all, please allow me to thank you all for very kindly sparing time to come here and listen to me. My sole object in coming to Canada has been to try and bring before the public in Canada what India and its people are and what they mean to this great community of nations. We, in India, form seventy-five per cent of the subjects of His Majesty, and naturally, when belonging to a different climate and perhaps a different race, many feelings arise in the minds of not only people living outside the British Empire, but also living within the British Empire, as to what the future holds for India within the Empire, and as to whether the future generations of this Empire will be able to hold together for their own defence and betterment and for the good of mankind, or whether for differences of race and economic benefits they are likely to fall asunder. That is a point which is likely to arise in the minds of all of us, no matter where we live.

Unfortunately, there is an impression, not only in Europe and the New World, but also in the minds of some of our brother citizens living in other parts of the Empire, that it is not possible for us all to work together for all times, because of the feeling that there is nothing in common between themselves and ourselves to keep us together. That, I feel, is based on a lack of knowledge. That is because you do not understand what we are or know what India stands for today.

Great Britain took over the administration of India in the year 1858, by a proclamation of Queen Victoria. I shall not say a word about the connection of the East India Company with the Indian public, because you know it as well as I do, and the less said the better. But since the day when His Majesty's Government took over the administration of the Company a new era dawned on India, and that unity has been able to establish throughout the whole of that great continent law and order, and peace, which are so essential for the educational, moral and economic progress of any nation in the world. It is that form of government which has united India into one people and in which we can now dream of calling ourselves one nation. That government has provided us with a common language which is foreign to us, and yet today it is ours as much as it is yours. That is the English language. We may not be able to understand each other when we come from the Northwest down to Madras. Yet, when we speak English we do.

During the whole of these eighty years our educational system has been based entirely on the English educational system. Our institutions have been planned by Englishmen, imported from England, and by Indians who have been educated in England.

We have for the first time in the history of the East imbibed from our British colleagues the idea of the sovereignty of the people. Before that we only knew the rule of one man, but since our connection with the British people this new thought has pervaded the whole of our country with the result that for the last seventy years representative institutions have been working in India successfully.

Some of you might think that the present Constitution which exists in India today has been born in a day because of certain political education put forward by ourselves to have the country ruled by our own people. No, that is not the work of one day. British association in India has built up a system of local bodies since the year 1870. There have been municipal committees working successfully throughout India since that time. We also have had representative institutions in our rural areas since that time. We call them District Boards, as you call them rural municipalities, which means they are composed of local people looking after their own local affairs and serving as a training ground for higher legislatures.

Since 1910 we have had legislative councils of varying degree and power. In 1919 we started a system of government that we call diarchy. We had elected representative houses with half of the Ministers responsible to the people and half of the Ministers responsible to the Crown; and in the year 1935 the new Constitution came which has eliminated that system of diarchy in the provinces. We have elected houses with no official members in them, and ministries which are responsible to the elected house, and ministries which can be turned out by an adverse vote of the Legislature; all departments in the provinces have been handed over to the Provincial Administrators, in the same way as is the case in Canada.

For the Central Government, a Federal Parliament has been provided which will exercise all its powers, except the control of the army and foreign relations.

However, our struggle for political control of the country has been a long one. Gradually one by one these things have come into our hands, just as it has been the case with all other countries, including your own.

We have a saying in India which is to the effect that your mother doesn't give you milk until you cry for it, and that is a very sound principle that has been found to exist in all countries in the world. You had to fight your Mother Country in order to get your political freedom, and in the same way in India we have had to fight for our political rights. These rights have come to us much easier than they have to you. Today in India you find the government of the whole continent has been allowed to pass into the hands of the people, without a fight or without a revolution. I think when history comes to be written it will be the greatest glory of England that she has trained nearly 400 million people in her own ways of freedom and democracy, with the result that today, after a short space of eighty years, they are able to take their place in the ranks of self-governing nations in the world. (Applause)

There may be criticism, and very justifiable criticism, advanced against the British Government in India. We all know, even now when we have national government in India, that there have been similar criticisms advanced against them. Criticism will be advanced against all governments in all countries, but in India, on occasions, it has been magnified. But we also know that but for this British control of India's problems, India would not be where she is today. We have only to look to other countries in the East. Show me one country which has such a democratic constitution today as India — even among those countries which are self-governing in the East. Show me one country under the suzerainty or sovereignty of any of the other European nations where you can find even the signs of self-government in its small municipalities. Not one. (Applause) And we know these things as well as the world knows them. But we don't talk of these things very frequently because it might give the Englishman a swollen head.

This political struggle against England, wherein some of our advanced politicians have threatened to go out of the Empire and proclaim independence, is exactly in the spirit of the Persian proverb that I am going to quote to you: "Threaten a man with death and he will be content to have fever." They wanted Dominion status like other sister Dominions, and they thought they would never get that unless they threatened England that they were going to desert her. Beyond that nobody in India wanted to leave the great Commonwealth of Nations, the boons of which we all know and which we all appreciate.

Mahatma Gandhi was asked one day what he meant by independence, and he said, "Independence in exactly the same way as Canada, South Africa and Australia."

Now, in this Nationalist Party, Mr. Gandhi's party, which has put up a very strong fight for political control of the country, the members have suffered enormously by going to jail and on account of peaceful strikes. Today out of the eleven British Provinces you have this party in power in eight, and all the Ministers, pledged to the National Congress Party, have sworn allegiance to the King. Only the other day, about three or four days ago, I received some newspaper cuttings and from these I learned that the Prime Minister in the Punjab, where I come from, had made a speech at a dinner party in Simla, stating that the Punjab would stand by His Majesty's Government in case of war. There also came news that the Congress Ministries had all declared that they would stand by the Mother Country in case of war. I am quoting these things to you only to show that the heart of India is sound, and that India will always be within the Empire. (Applause)

If there are any people who think that, because we have a difference of opinion with Great Britain regarding the pace of advance to our self-government, and that on account of that, we shall fall out with her or other sister Dominions, they are very much mistaken. Our future is cut out and decided, and that future lies within the British Empire. (Applause)

We in India have lost no time in making known to the world that in case of trouble India is behind the Mother Country; and, I have no doubt, that even those parts of the Empire, which have not opened their mouths so far, still have their hearts with the Mother Country. People who don't know us wonder why it is that in spite of India being declared a discontented country, according to the gutter press of most countries—with due apologies to the press here—we are a discontented revolutionary, yet when the occasion arises India's heart is found to be sound. The reason is not far to seek. Firstly, the outside world knows nothing about India, except what they learn from the nonsense written by some who travel through our country in three or four days and then come home and write about us. They also don't know what friendships, what economic friendships, and political ties exist between Great Britain and India. They don't know how much we value the great economic and industrial connections of Great Britain and India.

Why was it, if India were a discontented country, that during the last war she gave 1,400,000 men to fight for the King? Why was it, if India was a discontented country, that from my own province alone, the Punjab, there were 500,000 men who were recruited during the time the war was going on? And, let me tell you, that was without conscription that you had to have in Canada.

I know of several instances in the Punjab where leading men from the villages were called up by the District Officer and asked, "What can you do for your King in this hour of trial?" One man went home and brought both his sons, and he said, "I have nothing more valuable than these. Take them with you." And it is in this manner that those 500,000 men were found. That wasn't the contribution of an oppressed race. That was a gift of a willing and friendly heart, and it is that heart which exists in India today. Let me assure you that should there be another occasion India will not be found wanting.

Now, why is it that the Indian heart is with England? Has England done anything to deserve their loyalty and friendship? If so, what is it? Today we stand at the threshold of a new era in India, where the Government has been handed over to the elected representatives of the people, except for those two subjects, our army and foreign relations. Is there anything in that connection of eighty years which the Indian people appreciate and value? Yes, if you knew. Today England has handed over to India as a trustee of the people the entire wealth of the nation, undiminished — nay, not undiminished, but enhanced. You go down and ask the worst critic of Great Britain in India, and outside India, and not one man will be able to tell you that England has taken away an ounce of gold or a pound of corn unless it was paid for in the open market at market prices. (Applause) No cash contribution has been levied by England on India throughout that connection of eighty years, except for one instance, and that was during the war when India willingly contributed about £70 million for the common chest, because we were all fighting a common enemy. Otherwise, every anna realized in India by way of taxation has been spent in India. All the land belongs to the State, all the mineral wealth which is under the ground belongs to the State, all the forests and all the natural wealth in the way of social services; in India, eighty per cent of the railways belong to the State—the others are coming into the hands of the State when their leases expire, on payment of full compensation — and all the projects into which millions of pounds have been sunk to make people secure against famine belong to the State. All these have been handed over, by an honest trustee, in the most flourishing condition, to the children of India.

What else has England handed over to India that we value? It is the system of government. Our judicial system, our civil services, our co-operative, medical, and other departments. All our permanent servants of the Crown are recruited through Public Service Commissions, with security of their services ensured against all ministerial attacks (with due reverence). This system of administrative services is such that, you will find, the world has no example to show which can compare in efficiency and service to the public.

Besides these services, what else has England given to India? I think her greatest gift has been the training of the mind of the Indian people in ways of democracy and freedom. Now, Gentlemen, we are human beings, just as much as you are. We may not speak, but yet we appreciate what services have been rendered to India. By way of industry, today India is one of the first eight industrial countries of the world, enjoying a permanent seat on the International Labour Organization in Geneva; and just to give you an example of what industrial progress we have made I shall only quote one or two instances. You all know that India produces all the raw materials we need and we have a consuming market at our door. Gold and iron are plentiful. We have at the moment complete physical autonomy. (People in the New World or in Europe may be thinking today that India is being economically or industrially drained by England. There is nothing farther from the truth. Today, India is negotiating a trade pact with England, renewal of the trade peace, as a free and independent partner of this Empire.) And it is physical autonomy that has enabled India to build up her industry.

To give you one example. You hear so much about Lancashire and the row they make in the papers. In India today we are producing eighty-five per cent of the cloth, machine-made cloth, that we consume in India. During the course of the last ten or twelve years we have increased the number of our sugar-cane mills, with the result that we produce a million tons of white cane sugar in India today, and we are not importing an ounce from the Dutch East Indies, fifty per cent of whose factories are now closed because their market is gone. (If any of you here are interested in India, come and pay us a visit. We are not a hot country, full of snakes and mosquitoes, as some of you might think. We have some of the best climates in the world in the months of November, December, January and February. If you come to Delhi, you will come back and say, "Well, India by way of climate has as good a climate as Canada.") Now, all this industrial prosperity is appreciated by the public.

Don't run away with the idea, if you have been looking for Paradise on earth, that I have now found you one. We have many shortcomings in India. We are a very poor people. We are an agricultural country. Ninety per cent of us depend on the agricultural products of our land, and as there has been an agricultural slump, the purchasing power of the people is low; yet we feel that money is not everything in the world and without money, even though poor, we can yet be happy and contented. That contentment is given to us by a deep and a living faith in the living God. People say that God is on the side of the biggest battalions in the world. We do not believe in that theory of brute force. We believe that God is on the side of truth, and God lives in the minds of the humble and the meek.

Two years ago in England, one evening I was listening to my radio when the Archbishop of Canterbury issued an appeal to the people of Great Britain. He said, "During this night King Edward is going to make up his mind what to do. Let us all pray that God may give him true guidance." There was an Indian friend sitting by me and I said to him, "Take it from me, whatever King Edward does tomorrow, will be in the best interests of the nation," and he asked, "Why?" I said, "A nation that still believes in a God, the prayers of that nation will never remain unanswered when they seek guidance."

If there are any people in this modern age of materialism, greed and aggrandisement who still believe in God, you will find quite a few of them in England; and during my travels through this country, I am paying no lip compliment to you, it has been a source of great joy to me to find that the heart of the Canadian people is still with God. It is my sincere prayer that if this Empire of ours and its people wish eventually to succeed they must never give up their faith in God. Today some people may appear to be successful. They may be successful, but we, in India, as do you in Canada, know and realize that eventually truth will shine. It is our sincere hope that while we continue to arm ourselves for defence, yet the love of God may continue to live in our hearts.

One of our well-known ascetic poets has said: "A human heart without the love of God is like a sugarcane without sugar, like a nightingale without song, like an organ without music, like a flower without scent."

(Applause—prolonged)

Mr. D. M. Gowdy: I am going to ask Mr. J. P. Pratt, the President of The Empire Club to express the thanks of this audience.

Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.: Your Honour, Sir Firozkhan, Mr. Conant, Gentlemen: My first word of thanks is to the wise Indian Government which selected Sir Firozkhan Noon as its High Commissioner. But for that wisdom we would not have had the great privilege of listening today to what I consider has been one of the most illuminating and inspiring addresses that has ever been presented to a Canadian audience by a representative of our sister Dominion. Sir Firozkhan has come to us at considerable personal inconvenience, because during the luncheon he told me that during the entire three weeks he has been in Canada he has not even had a Sunday to himself.

We trust that Sir Firozkhan, in accepting our sincere thanks will take back with him to England, his present homeland, and convey to his fellow citizens in our sister Dominion, the best wishes of the Canadian and Empire Clubs for their long continuance with us in the British Empire. (Applause)

MR. D. M. GOWDY: The meeting is adjourned.

"TRANS-CANADA AIR LINES"

An Address by MR. PHILIP G. JOHNSON

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, October 27, 1938.

The President: Your Worship, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: Today it is possible to post a letter in Great Britain and have it transported entirely by air to Cape Town, South Africa. Similarly, a service is in effect between Great Britain and Australia, via India and Singapore. Now what of this part of the British Empire? Today the Trans-Canada Air Lines carries express between Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal. It carries mail between the same cities. It carries passengers between Vancouver and Winnipeg, and just as soon as the transatlantic portion of the service is established it will be possible to carry air mail from Great Britain to Vancouver. Thus, the British Empire will be entirely connected by air service.

The formation of the Trans-Canada Air Lines and the installation of the service naturally falls upon those who are experienced. We hear the roar of a plane. We admire the courage and skill of the young man who is piloting the plane, but there are others charged with great responsibility because the young pilot had to be carefully trained and just as carefully selected. These men must be men of experience. The man who has had charge of the formation of the Trans-Canada Air Service is our guest-speaker today. Mr. Philip G. Johnson is the Vice-President of the Trans-Canada Air Lines and has had a long association with flying, starting in the year 1917. In 1933, he rose to be president of the outstanding and leading flying service of the United States. In Canada he is the Vice-President of our Trans-Canada Air Lines. He is a man in whom I feel sure we can have the greatest confidence and we look forward to a very splendid achievement under his tutelage. I have much pleasure in calling on Mr. Philip G. Johnson, Vice-President of the Trans-Canada Air Lines.

Mr. Philip G. Johnson: Mr. Chairman, Your Worship, Honoured Guests, Members of the Empire Club: In discussing this address with Mr. Pratt in Ottawa the other day, he laid down three rules. One, that I should not engage in any oratory. Secondly, I should be non-technical; and thirdly, that I should consume a certain number of minutes. Well, the first one is easy, because I couldn't do it in any event, and I will try to live up to the other two requirements.

Flying in Canada is not particularly new or novel, and I would like to disabuse your minds of the thought that those of us in Trans-Canada are pioneering. The pioneering has all been done for us in the decade that preceded the formation of the Trans-Canada Air Lines. As far as history is concerned, the first mechanical flight achieved in Canada occurred in February of 1909 when Mr. McCurdy flew an aeroplane of his own design and construction in Nova Scotia. He made one or two flights, and that ended the development for the time being. The history of aviation in Canada from that early beginning until the world war was practically the same as in any other part of the globe. Nothing very much happened. Then the world war came along and the aeroplane saw its first real beginning as an entity out of which some use could be made. Unfortunately, it became a weapon of destruction, and during the war we saw the formation of the first aerial defences.

The war being over, we had a number of pilots and a lot of military aircraft, not only in Europe, but also on this side of the water, and not very much to do with them. As a result early beginnings were made in the use of aircraft for commercial purposes. I doubt very much whether aircraft were used more extensively in any other part of the world than in Canada in the early 20's. All of the equipment, of course, was military and had to be rebuilt to suit the particular purpose for which the early pioneers decided to use it. One of the first uses was an extensive mapping programme throughout the Dominion and I think I am correct in stating that the mapping of the Dominion of Canada has proceeded, or did proceed during that time, to a greater extent than any other place in the world. The maps, of course, you are all familiar with, and if you desire to see the difference between the Dominion before 1920 and after 1920, just compare the maps. It was all camera work, and the camera doesn't lie.

Also, exploratory flights began into the North Country, tending toward the development of our mineral wealth. I believe I am safe in saying that the aeroplane has done more for the development of the so-called North Country in Canada, than any other single agency. I am speaking now of those areas as yet untouched by surface transportation.

To illustrate how far, or to what extent the aeroplane has been used in Canada, I can quote some statistics here for the year 1936, and I am told that 1937 will not vary much from the figures that I will give you. All machinery supplies and people going into the North Country are transferred by air. In 1936, some 26,000,000 pounds of freight were carried by aircraft into the North Country here in Canada. The loads consisted of everything from oxen to mining machinery, and this movement is still going on today.

To give you comparison with loads carried elsewhere, all the domestic air lines within the United States in the same period carried but 7,000,000 pounds. In other words, we carried approximately four times as much freight by air here in Canada as was carried by all of the domestic lines in the United States in the period under review.

The first use of the aeroplane as a carrier of mail in Canada began in the prairie sections in 1928. Early in 1928 regular scheduled flights were carried out between Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, and Edmonton. After a beginning was made, they later introduced the carrying of passengers and were well on the way to the organization of a Trans-Canada schedule air transport service. Unfortunately, the operation died an untimely death, for in 1930, I believe, the contracts for carrying the mails were cancelled for reasons of economy and from that day until 1938 no regular Trans-Canada air mail service was in existence. This left the Dominion the only large country of any importance in the entire world which did not have a regular, scheduled air service connecting its main points of distribution.

In the meantime, the North Country operators had developed and continued to operate as they are operating today. In April of 1937 the Trans-Canada Act became a law and under its terms Trans-Canada Air Lines was formed. I am not going to burden you with all the details of the law. I am simply going to point out what is required under the Act. The Act prescribes the corporate setup, the method of selecting Directors, the capitalization, and so on and so forth. It also prescribes a method of selection of routes, a control of schedules, and provides for a method of payment for the carrying of mails. The period between April of 1937 and July of the same year was taken up with the corporate proceedings incident to the formation of the corporation. As of July 1st, 1937, Trans-Canada existed purely as a corporate entity, with a Board of Directors. It had made no effort to begin operations or plans for their operations, although it is true that five aircraft had been tentatively ordered. On July 1st the actual organization began and the first step was to make a study of the problem ahead of us. This was done by an aerial survey over the route to be flown, namely, from Vancouver over the Rockies and on East to Toronto and Montreal and then to the Maritimes, terminating finally in Moncton.

This survey had for its purpose four things. One was to determine what airway facilities were available, how far construction had been undertaken at the major terminals, or major points of distribution, and what had to be done in order to meet one of the requirements of the Act, which required Trans-Canada Air Lines to operate a service comparable to those existing in other parts of North America.

The second point was to plan a communication system by radio across Canada and to select the sites for the location of these stations.

Thirdly we had to determine what the personnel problem would be, and from what source we could draw pilots, mechanics, and other employees.

Finally, we had to select a place where we could set up a training school.

The airway facilities started to come into being in Canada about 1928, when the Department of National Defence planned a system of landing fields for an airway across Canada. The plans were originally made, of course, to accommodate the aeroplanes of that day. This development proceeded on through until 1936, at which time the task was turned over to the Department of Transport, together with general control over civil aviation operations in Canada.

We went into all of these things quite thoroughly, landing in all of the fields, checking up on facilities as they existed, and trying to make a mental note and study of what would be required to carry on a service such as the law or Act prescribed. We found in a general way that nearly all of the western communities, that is from Winnipeg west, had provided quite comprehensive facilities, which probably grew out of the fact that they had had a preliminary service in 1928. We also found that the development of the airports for terminal purposes had been much more far-sighted than we had formerly been accustomed to in the United States, where our terminal facilities were carried to conclusions with no particular thought to the future. As a result, many of the terminal airports in the States will have to be rebuilt or relocated because they are not capable of expansion to take care of the larger aeroplanes now coming into general use. In Canada, however, those responsible for the planning did a good job because in nearly every instance—I don't know of any specific exceptions—the fields were so planned that they could be expanded to provide landing facilities that could adequately take care of such aircraft as might reasonably be expected to be used. That means, roughly speaking, an area about a mile square, with unobstructed approaches. I am not saying that all of them have been developed to that point but they are capable of expansion when the need arises, without losing the investment that has been placed in them.

We also found that the intermediate or so-called emergency fields were adequate for the smaller type of aircraft, but hardly adequate for the larger and faster aircraft which are designated for use on Trans-Canada, and which we would of necessity have to use in order to compete with other transcontinental lines in North America.

We proceeded on to Montreal and then made recommendations to our superiors, the Board of Directors. We suggested that a system be set up that would divide the country into two general divisions, the dividing line being at Winnipeg, which is approximately the geographical centre of the line. This would provide for the operation of a Western Division and an Eastern Division. We submitted a recommendation to the Directors to serve on the Department of Transport, who are charged with the development of the intermediate fields, that Trans-Canada would require fully usable fields at one hundred mile intervals, lighted for night flying, equipped with radio ranges, and other facilities necessary for safe navigation of aircraft under the present technique of flying.

We further set up an organization by which pilots could be trained in the technique of flying proposed, and in the particular aircraft which had been purchased, or were under order, none of which had been available in Canada prior to that time.

With that beginning we began accepting employees about October 1st of 1937, and wound up the last of that month with forty-one employees. The number has been gradually built up until now in Trans-Canada we have some 300 full time employees, including pilots, mechanics, dispatchers, radio operators, office help and so on and so forth.

The pilot training was our chief concern because in order to adequately operate a transcontinental line it would be necessary to engage almost entirely in instrument flying. Flying in Canada, in so far as the north country operations are concerned, does not require that type of flying in its entirety. Contact flying serves their purpose, but where a line is engaged on a scheduled daily operation across the country, instrument flying must be engaged in. Therefore we set up the training school in Winnipeg and engaged our first pilots. Uniformly, we selected pilots of Canadian birth and of the forty pilots we now have on our payroll, all except three of them come from operators here in Canada. We have been given extreme co-operation by the other commercial operators in the release of their personnel to Trans-Canada in order that we could build a nucleus of our organization. Two of the men were Canadians who had found employment with Imperial Airways in England, and who were desirous of coming back to Canada to live. One man we picked up in the United States, who was a Canadian citizen and who had been flying for one of the air lines down there.

We divided the flying force into two sections. The first step was to give them a thorough understanding of the craft they were to fly. That was more or less a class-room job and it took three to four weeks. In other words, we required all of our pilots to have a thorough knowledge of the mechanism of the aircraft. From there they went into instrument flying, night flying and radio range flying, and so on, and so forth, and finally checked out on both types of aeroplane we were using.

The best evidence that I can give you gentlemen as to the type of pilot that Trans-Canada has today is that of all the applicants that have been given employment, we have only had to dispense with three men as failing to meet requirements we set up. I think that speaks very highly for the type of pilot available here in Canada. The type of equipment narrowed itself down to that which we could buy and of which we could obtain delivery at an early date. As a matter of fact the first aircraft were ordered in April of 1937. They were not delivered until November and December of that year, and it is only within the last thirty days that we have received the final aircraft of the fifteen with which we are starting out. The aircraft selected was of the Lockheed type, which is extensively used throughout the United States, and also on the British Airways and is the same type of aircraft as recently ordered by Great Britain for military use. It is also the same type of aircraft as used recently by Howard Hughes in his flight around the world.

The aircraft are equipped with all the latest usable devices to aid in navigation. These include the usual complement of instruments, centrifugal meters, bank and turn indicators, and the automatic pilot by which it is possible to guide an aeroplane on a given course without the aid of the pilot, other than to adjust the instrument, which amounts to something like tuning in your radio. All of the aircraft, of course, are equipped for radio reception, as we navigate entirely by following what we term the "beam." Now, the beam station is a radio device by which directive radio rays can be sent out, and the Department of Transport has installed these stations at about one hundred mile intervals across Canada. As long as a pilot stays on his course he receives one type of signal. The minute he turns to left or to right, another signal is given to him and until he gets back on his course he receives a signal,—an "A" signal, or an "N" signal, as the case might be. When he is on the course he receives a monotone. This type of flying has been very highly developed in the United States. Because of the distances involved and because of the similarity between the terrain here in Canada and the United States, we have adopted that type of navigation, rather than the triangulation system, or as it is generally known in the trade the D. F. system. However, we later expect to experiment with a combination of the two systems.

All this has meant a tremendous amount of work. All the stations had to be selected. Because a radio station has been located, it doesn't necessarily mean it is going to work. A lot of things hinder operation. For example, in Western Canada, our transmission is very good. We get east of Winnipeg and it becomes very poor. That springs from the fact that the resistance of conductivity to the ground is about three times as great in the west as in the east. This cuts down the effective range of the signal in the latter case. Then, too, the type of aircraft that is being used requires that we have paved runways. These paved runways must be contact lighted for night flying. This also involves considerable work.

However, taking everything into consideration, there exist in Canada today some twenty-four radio ranges which are in constant operation and which Trans-Canada is using day and night, seven days a week. Four more are under construction. We have 15 major aircraft usable for this type of operation, most of which have been imported in the last twelve months. Although airport construction has dated from 1928, the fields have been improved and enlarged, lighted and so forth, within the last twelve month period. Fourteen intermediate fields, fully equipped to handle aircraft up to a gross weight of around 25,000 pounds, have also been developed. They are fully lighted and can be used at any time during the day or night when weather conditions permit flying to be carried on.

I want also to correct a misapprehension that you may have in your minds as to how often we can fly. There are certain types of weather and certain conditions of weather in which it is impossible to fly, and we are not attempting that. We can fly "blind" as long as we stay in the air. When we start to come down "blind" we get into trouble. Despite press reports and magazine articles, we haven't yet arrived at that point. Our schedules run to some 6,200 miles a day and we have flown, since October of last year, just under 2,000,000 miles, having operated on a basis of about ninety per cent completion. In other words we have completed ninety per cent of the mileages that we have set out to fly.

Other things that we had to provide were hangar facilities and shop facilities. They did not exist in all locations. They could not be rented. Hence, we had to design and build our own. We have two completed hangars at the present time; one with shop facilities for the complete overhaul of engines and aircraft at Winnipeg, and one at Lethbridge. We are also constructing a hangar at your Malton airport. In the design of a standard hangar we tried to eliminate the mistake that had been made elsewhere, and anticipate the size of aircraft that might be used five or six years from now. The mistake made in the United States was that the hangars were built just big enough for the aircraft then being used, and when the larger ones came along the existing hangars had to be scrapped and new ones constructed. The hangars we have designed and built are of an entirely different type. At the present time they are big enough to house the equipment we are using, but it is also possible to expand them so they can handle aircraft up to a size of about 200 feet in span, without losing any essential part of the building. The hangars being constructed here in Canada are unique as compared with any other hangars we know of in the world today. In other words, we are trying to provide for the future, but we are trying to do it on a progressive basis so that we will not have to make too large a capital expenditure at the inception.

The actual flying of the route, of course, had to wait until facilities were completed, the radio ranges, beacon lights and fields. We also had to await the time when we were sufficiently satisfied with our pilots to turn them loose on aircraft for cross country purposes. I might say in passing that each aircraft we are using on a transcontinental route today represents an investment of about $130,000.

In March of 1938 we began a systematic scheduled service from Winnipeg to Vancouver. This was the final stage of the pilots' training. It began first as a daylight operation, leaving Winnipeg in the morning and arriving at Vancouver in the late afternoon and vice versa. About April 1st, we turned that into a night operation and since April 1st it has been flying daily during the hours of darkness. On September 1st we initiated a schedule into Montreal. As yet that is a daylight operation, but within the next ninety to a hundred and twenty days it will swing into an all-night operation. The reason for the night operation is quite obvious in that our first job is to carry the mail. Consequently, we must have schedules that give the best mail advantage. It is going to be possible to leave Montreal at nine o'clock in the evening, leave here about an hour and a half later, and deliver that mail into Vancouver about noon the next day. It is going to be possible to leave Vancouver at seven o'clock in the evening and have the mail in Toronto or in Montreal for the first afternoon delivery, the next day, using the present aircraft and flying at an average speed of about 180 miles an hour, including all stops.

One of the major problems in the conduct of an air transportation system is a thorough knowledge of the weather; not only the spot weather along the airways, but what to expect in two hours, three hours, or twelve hours from now. That is a function of the Meteorological Department of the Department of Transport. Its headquarters are here in Toronto and it is under the general direction of Dr. Patterson. Dr. Patterson has gone a long way in developing a very thorough meteorological service. We will have forecasting centres at Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Kapuskasing, Toronto, and Montreal, and eventually in Moncton. These forecasting centres will be connected by radio and by teletype to points along the line and to points in the United States, so that a continuous interchange of weather information can be maintained. They will also be connected by short wave radio with observing stations at points in the country north of the air line, so that adequate forecasts can be made. The system is now in operation west of Winnipeg and is gradually being put into shape from Winnipeg east. I can say without fear of contradiction that within the next 24 months the Meteorological Service here in Canada, designed initially for air transport, will not have to take a back seat to any other similar service. Without adequate weather coverage it would be impossible to carry on any kind of a regular air operation.

Now, you have heard quite a lot, I imagine, and it has been my experience in discussions with people throughout Canada, that they all seem to think it is a land of ice and snow, a lot of cold weather, and impossible mountain conditions. As a matter of fact we do not fear any terrain or any weather conditions that we have so far encountered. We don't believe the situation here is any worse than it is elsewhere. As a matter of fact in many respects the Trans-Canada route is easier to fly than the routes in the United States. In the first place our mountain areas are relatively short. The distance across the Rocky Mountains is only 486 miles. That compares with some 1,200 miles of mountain flying immediately south of us. When we leave Vancouver we climb to an altitude of 11,000 feet and at that altitude we are 2,500 feet higher than any range we have to cross before we strike the prairies at Lethbridge. In the emergency fields in the mountains, not one exceeds 4,000 feet above sea level. As you may know, the height of a field above sea level determines the ease or the difficulty in landing or taking off. The higher above sea level, the more difficult the landing or takeoff because the air is less dense. Comparable lines in the States have regularly used fields as high as 7,000 feet above sea level. Once we cross the Rockies for a distance of 486 miles, we are in a plains country with the highest elevation about 3,200 feet. We go across plains country until we get about a hundred miles east of Winnipeg. Then we are in country with which you are probably as familiar as I am, a rolling, rocky country with innumerable lakes—I would say millions of them—and very sparsely populated areas. That obtains until we get down to approximately a few miles north of

North Bay and then we are in country similar to that in our immediate vicinity.

From the standpoint of terrain we don't anticipate any difficulty. As far as weather is concerned, the colder the weather the less difficulty we will have in flying. We get better engine performance. There is a little more difficulty in starting, perhaps, but as far as flying is concerned, it offers no particular hazard. It eliminates completely one of the big bugaboos of present day flying, that of ice. The colder it is the less moisture there is in the air and consequently the less chance for formation of ice. We are not yet thoroughly familiar with what weather conditions we are going to get into, and we anticipate some ice difficulties, particularly just before the winter sets in and during the spring thaw, but I don't think our difficulties will be any more severe than have been met with and conquered in other parts of the world.

I could go on indefinitely, talking about this, that and the other thing, but I would like to close by saying that the task of putting a transcontinental air line across Canada is really a three-party proposition. First of all, the company that is charged with the operation and the organization of the actual flying. Secondly, the Government, that is represented by the Post Office Department and the Department of Transport. The Post Office furnishes our pay-load, and the Department of Transport the ground facilities necessary to carry on the work. The third partner is the public. No matter how well the first two partners co-operate, or how well we do our job, the company cannot be a success, or the service a success, unless the public uses it, and uses it intelligently. We are not yet ready to act as your servant, because we have followed the procedure of making haste slowly. We desire to leave no stone unturned to build a foundation by which we can take our place as a scheduled air transport service that is as safe and as well operated as any other in the world. By intelligent use of the air service for your mail, for your express and for your passengers—I mean to use it when it serves an economic purpose, not just because of a fad that passes from day to day—I am sure our air service will serve an economic need in Canada and that through such use, Trans-Canada Air Lines, which is your company, will succeed.

I thank you. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Your Worship and Gentlemen: What a simple thing it is to operate an airway! I am sure that listening to Mr. Johnson has given us an entirely different idea of what is going on across our country. He speaks of the millions of lakes in Northern Ontario which none but his pilots have seen. He tells us of all the background in connection with the preparation for the operation of a plane to carry your letter and mine. I think you will agree with me that the administration of Trans - Canada Air Lines, when it is in the hands of a man who says he is making haste slowly, and that safety is the first consideration, cannot be in better hands, and on your behalf I extend a very cordial "Thank you" to Mr. Johnson.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"WHY WASTE MONEY ON ART GALLERIES?"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. W. G. CONSTABLE

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, November 3, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: Sir Robert Falconer, Sir Wyly Grier, and Gentlemen of The Empire Club: We are indeed fortunate in having as our guest-speaker today a gentleman who is recognized as a world expert in several parts of his chosen field of art. Mr. Constable was born in England and was educated at Cambridge. He became a Barrister, but gave that up to join the troops in 1914. Following the war he went into the field of art, and became lecturer in Fine Arts, first at his Alma Mater, Cambridge, and later at the Universities of Hull and Bristol. He has held many high offices in the galleries of England, and in 1933, at the invitation of the National Gallery of Canada, he made a tour of the various galleries of our Dominion from coast to coast. He remained in England until this spring, when at the invitation of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston he accepted the position of Curator of Paintings. It is my privilege and pleasure to introduce Mr. W. G. Constable, Curator of Pantings, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts. (Applause)

MR. W. G. CONSTABLE: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen. Has it ever occurred to you to speculate on what would happen to the majority of the buildings in Whitehall, London, in an ideal state of society, an ideal that any one of us might cherish? The War Office and the Admiralty would cease to function. They might survive as ministries of pageantry, but their present functions would all disappear. The Treasury would be one of the first offices to go. In fact, the whole paraphernalia, the whole mechanism of government would be laid flat, with two exceptions. You would preserve and cherish the National Gallery at one end of Whitehall; and at the other you would preserve and cherish Westminster Abbey.

That illustrates my main thesis today, that Art is not a mere decoration of life, is not a mere adjunct to more serious affairs, but a fundamental and indispensable element in life. Of course, it is often said: What about problems such as food, clothing, shelter? Those, after all, are more indispensable. Certainly they are more indispensable for the continuance of life, for mere existence; but after all they are the means of life and what I am suggesting to you is that in art we have one of the ends of life, one of the purposes of life, and one of the most important ends and purposes. If this be admitted, the question arises, what can Art bring into the life of the ordinary man? The answer is tolerably easy to give.

The spirit, the essence of Art lies in order, proportion and harmony, in an exact adjustment of means to ends. That is the prime function of what Art can do for us today. But over and above that is the function of giving inspiration, not merely to the chosen few, but to the great majority of people.

I put this general thesis forward in order to come now to a particular application; and to suggest to you that for Art to play its part in the life of an ordered and civilized society, one of the most important agencies is art galleries.

Now, the old conception of art galleries was that they were a kind of store-house into which anything that wasn't good enough to keep in a house might very conveniently go, and into which you could unload for example a portrait too bad even to sell or give away. That, of course, merely brings art galleries, to say nothing of Art, into contempt. But today a new conception is gaining and has gained ground, that the art gallery is the collection of the community. It is the community's way of bringing together for its delectation and inspiration fine things so that those who run may read and enjoy.

Given this point of view the question at once comes up, how can the modern art gallery fulfill its function? Broadly speaking, an art gallery concerns three sets of people. It has a duty (and a great duty) toward the creative artist; it has to look after the public as a whole; and finally it has to have an eye to the scholar and the student.

Now, the importance of the care for the creative artist is if you want Art in life you can't have it unless you have artsts; so the art gallery must take its share in looking after the man who makes fine things. This it can do in several ways. In the first place it can provide him, or should provide him with standards of achievement. It can set before him not dead things that have come down from the past, but living examples of his art and craft. It is important to realize that the best way in which this can be done is not for an art student or an artist to go into an art gallery and make a copy of some particular work there. Rather the gallery should give him a fundamental knowledge of what constitutes good Art. It is curious to note that the great French architect, Corbusier, learned the principles of the methods of modern architecture, not by studying modern buildings at all, but by a six months series of careful investigation of the principles on which the Parthenon had been built. That is an intelligent way to use the art of the past.

Then, again, the art gallery can and should provide a market for the wares of living, creative artists and by so doing help to encourage other people to take an interest in it and buy what he has to sell. In fact, the art gallery is one of the channels for civic patronage of the Arts. This is becoming increasingly important because owing to circumstances, the broad development of economic forces, the race of great private patrons is to a certain extent disappearing, and more and more the responsibility is thrown upon the community as a whole to provide fine things it needs.

What I have said about the creative artist applies not merely to the man who makes individual works of art with his own hands; it applies just as much to the product of the manufacturer and the artist working in collaboration. We have got to admit that machine and large scale production have come to stay. The ordinary man has to use the thing which is produced on a large scale. It is one of the major problems of the day to provide for the artist to work in collaboration with the man who controls actual production. But whenever industrial products, as many of them do today, deserve to be ranked as works of art, then I hold it is part of the duty of an art gallery to recognize that fact and to provide both a market and a show-ground for those things.

So much then for what the art gallery can do for artists engaged in making things. Now, we come to the general public. Here, perhaps the most vital thing the art gallery does is to make the man in the street feel that Art has got some importance. To use the words of a great British journalist, Mr. James Bone, a gallery can help to make the general public "art conscious," and then having, as it were, created a wish and a desire, set out to satisfy it. I often think we underrate the importance of this function of the gallery. For me, one of the most cheering things that has happened recently in London has been the extent to which at lunch time and after work large numbers of young people drop in—that is the only word you can use—to the National Gallery, and for a quarter of an hour or half an hour enjoy themselves; and if a gallery can provide in the otherwise somewhat drab life of the young people, that particular type of young people in England, a moment of inspiration and enjoyment, then surely it is making a tremendous and valuable contribution to life.

Another thing an art gallery can do is to provide for the ordinary man and woman standards as to what is good and bad in itself. You set before them examples which will help to shape their taste and through the shaping of that taste influence the artist and the manufacturer to provide articles of good design. This doesn't mean, of course, that the things he buys need be expensive. What I have in mind is this, that if a man or woman has formed, as it were, good standards of taste, then when they go to the five and ten cent store, they naturally inevitably go for the glass of good shape, the lamp shade of reasonable taste and design, rather than for the bad; and so you introduce almost automatically into their daily lives an element of pleasure and an element of beauty.

Now, lastly, what can the art gallery do for the student and scholar? Now, it is often forgotten that for the introduction of the vitalizing element of art into life much more than a general acquaintance with the Arts is necessary. You must have behind everything, the man who is deeply versed and well informed. The gallery can or ought to be a kind of laboratory, and a means of providing a corpus of material, a corpus of knowledge on which he can base his standards.

Thus, the gallery has got, somehow or other, to look in three directions and bring three main lines of action into harmony. The question is how can it best do it?

That problem has got two main aspects. First of all is the question, what kind of things is the gallery going to buy or acquire? The second is, how is it going to exhibit them in the most effective way?

Take first the question of acquisition. Of course, the ideal gallery, the gallery of our dreams, should include fine examples of every art and craft that the world has ever produced. That, of course, is out of the question. Not only are gallery funds limited, but the things in many cases do not exist. They are already sealed up and are inaccessible. So automatically, the range of any gallery is limited. Assuming this, the first principle a gallery must work upon is that whatever it gets should be good of its kind. It is easy to say that but much more difficult to put it into practice. It isn't the same thing as saying it should always buy expensive things. It is saying it should buy good things. For example, I would very much rather see in a living-room a really well-shaped piece of betel-ware bought from the "five and ten," than an inferior piece of glass dignified by the name of Waterford. This obligation to acquire good things means, for example, that galleries should not set out on the dangerous path of what is known as "gap filling" and because it doesn't happen to have an example of something or other it should accept an inferior thing to put in that gap. Once a gallery starts "gap filling" with inferior things, inevitably it tends to become a junk shop.

Because the gallery has to look for good, though not necessarily expensive things, it must look gift horses in the mouth to the utmost. It is a great temptation to accept the unworthy object because you think the giver thereof may have something better up his sleeve in the future. But when that problem arises, as it continually arises in my own museum, the only thing is to harden one's heart and turn for confirmation to the policy of the British National Gallery of never pandering to that kind of consideration. Say, Is the thing good enough or isn't it? and you refuse it or accept it solely on that decision. Though you may offend an individual here and there you begin to find that when people know your standard is high, they begin to tumble over themselves to give you fine things because it becomes an honour to have a piece of work given by them to the gallery. That is sound and true psychology.

Proceeding on the principle that a gallery should go for what is good, a gallery must cut its coat according to its cloth. It is a delusion, if you have only limited funds, to try and buy high sounding titles. That is the way of death. It is of no real use to a gallery to buy a damaged or decayed picture, because it was once a Rembrandt. It may have been so, but it is no service to anyone merely to be able to put on the frame a magic name. It would be far better to get a first rate example of a second rate master than something that is virtually nothing but a name.

This particular point raises another very important matter. That is how far ought a gallery to make use of reproductions? Now, I am one of the people—I am possibly a heretic who considers that everybody has to face the local situation and the local situation may be such that the use of reproductions is important or indeed essential.

It isn't always possible to have all you want for the purposes which you set out to serve and consequently it may be invaluable to have good reproductions which are frankly put forward as reproductions, as substitutes for the real thing, but which studied by the side of the real things may serve an extremely useful purpose.

To turn to another working principle of the live art gallery. What it acquires should, I think, always take into account local conditions. I have emphasized that in the case of reproductions, and I emphasize it still more in the general policy of acquisition. A gallery must consider conditions, the kind of community you have to serve. But it isn't enough to say, "O, well, we won't have that because the people in the city aren't likely to be interested in it." It is your business to make them interested in coming to see fine things, at the same time such considerations as the encouragement of local artists; the building of a collection which shows, for good or ill, what the artists of a district have done in the past; the emphasis in some particular branch of the collection of a close relation to local industry. All these things should play their part. That is not to say the gallery should play down in any way to local sentiment. Rather in the high standards it sets, with the high principles which inspire its practice it should combine consideration for the interests, for the predispositions of the the citizens to whom the gallery belongs.

Limitation of range on these lines has proved very successful in Great Britain. For example specialization on a particular type of art has been very successful in the City of Leicester. The gallery had very limited funds to develop representation of the British school of painting as a whole. Therefore, they decided to build up a collection of water colours and drawings only of the British school, which is now one of the best collections of its kind in Great Britain. That was an example of seeking for the best but of limiting range in accordance with the amount of your resources, while definitely stimulating a local interest.

Turn now to another set of problems which the art gallery has to face. I have already mentioned the question of the acceptance of gifts. Now comes the question of purchase. The Director and his Committee, I think, have in most places an extraordinarily difficult load to carry in the providing of adequate funds. Galleries adequately endowed are rare; and a major problem is how to interest benefactors. Sir Sidney Cockerall, of the Fitzwilliam Museum, is a master in this respect. He would somehow or other secure funds to build a gallery, and then, pointing to a gallery with nothing to put in it, would conjure out of somebody's pocket the wherewithal to fill the gallery. Then, having got that far, would go to the next person and suggest he should provide a gallery for acquisitions which could not be properly shown. It sounds very easy. But it needs a great personality to do it and ingenuity in raising funds is an indispensable part of a gallery's activity.

Then, there is another problem involved in purchases. You can't just go out into the market and buy, as it were, Rembrandts by the bushel. You have to watch, you have to wait, you have to explore the market. You have to play this fish, while you are eagerly hoping a much bigger fish will come along on your hook, and all that, of course, takes a great deal of time and more often it involves a certain amount of outlay.

I always regard it as essential that the director and the governing body of a gallery should make frequent visits to centres where works of art are bought and sold, and such excursions should be regarded not as holidays, as leave almost illicitly taken, but rather as very necessary even though a very severe and tiring part of gallery work. Unless you are prepared, for example, here in Toronto, to be in and out of the New York market, and fairly frequently in and out of the London market, you will never really be able to put your fingers on fine things at a reasonable price.

That raises, of course, what I know is one of the most difficult problems of all—how on earth to decide what to buy and conscious as I am of the Director of the Toronto Gallery and many of his Trustees on my right and left, I don't hesitate to say that in the long run the decision of what you buy has got to rest with one man. A committee is an excellent thing, but it cannot function, because it lives on compromise, and compromise in a decision as to goodness or badness in work of art is fatal. One of the greatest Directors of all time, Wilhelm Bode, in whose hands the Kaiser Fredrich Museum became one of the greatest museums in the world, once said to me, "No Director is worth his salt unless he makes at least two mistakes out of six." "What do you mean?" I said. He replied: "A fellow has no gumption, no enterprise, if he doesn't make that proportion of mistakes. You have got to do it if you are going to get fine things. You have got to risk something." And those are words that I feel should be engraved on the note paper of every gallery in the world.

I rejoice that the Boston Museum today consistently follows the system of giving the Curators their heads. But the value to an art gallery of a Committee must not be underestimated. It introduces an element of general wisdom, of knowledge of all the surrounding circumstances which nothing whatever can replace and which no one man can provide. I am merely suggesting that for purchases you have to have a final "Yes" or "No" in one man's mind. Of course you have also to give this one man an adequate technical assistance and help. No one man can be an authority on everything. That again is a problem. But if you are going to get the best you must be prepared to cast your bread to some extent upon the waters, and provide a man with an adequate staff, whose experience and knowledge can be added to that of the Director.

The next problem is—if we do all these things how are we going to get the money for things other than works of art? I have suggested how ingenious trustees and committees can conjure gifts, either money or works of art out of individual donors; but it is a very much more difficult problem providing for the gas and water side of the gallery, which has no romance. You can't go to a person and say, "Will you pay the electric light bill for a year?" That doesn't yield any credit or any particular beneficent reaction. At the same time gas bills have to be paid and the problem of finance is therefore a very vital one.

Well, it is not for me to suggest methods of raising money, but there is one principle of financial administration I feel is of vital importance. Perhaps the Toronto Gallery pursues it but in certain galleries it is not pursued. You should be able to accumulate a surplus and carry any surplus you may accumulate over to the next year. The British Treasury, in all ordinary civil service departments, does not allow this; but mercifully, under pressure, the great museums may now, if they save anything, carry it over to the next year and the benefit of that is this, that they can embark on long range policy. You can watch and wait for the really fine thing. You can build up a fund to do redecoration on a large scale, the large scheme of installation. If at the end of every year you feel any savings you may have made are going as it were down the sink, then you are helpless. What happens in certain galleries is that toward the end of the financial year you find a director going out in the market and buying any rubbish he can lay his hands upon or embarking on some superfluous scheme of installation in order to get something with the surplus he may otherwise lose.

Now, finally, if you have got your works of art, your building and your gas and your water, how are you going to exhibit all the things you possess? You have to bear in mind that you are serving three masters—the creative artist, the general public and the scholar and student. The scholar and student is generally a queer fish in that he wants to see everything you have got, good or bad. On the other hand, the creative artist and the general public aren't interested in seeing everything. There is a particular type of thing you have that they want to see, or a few things well displayed. So today the basic notion of having display galleries as distinct from study galleries is steadily gaining ground and it is the solution of a great many problems. The museum and gallery that has carried that perhaps farther than any one I know is the National Museum of Wales, in Cardiff, where two parallel galleries are separated by a range of arches. In one the Director and his assistant make a display of a selection of things from different departments which are regularly varied. In the other gallery, the exhibits are arranged in an orderly way, though close packed, so the student can see them easily and see them all. The general public and men like the creative artists want to get a stimulus and standards, and they use the exhibition gallery; the scholar and student use both. That, I think, is the secret of good and effective gallery arrangement. In this connection a system which was adopted first, I believe, in the British Museum, is worth mentioning; one which has met with even greater success in the Victoria and Albert Museum in England, is that of having an exhibit of the week, a thing not necessarily chosen because it is rare and expensive, but because it is fine. It is brought out and given a little separate show in a case by itself, thereby attracting public attention and stimulating those who see it to follow up the knowledge and interest aroused. In Boston it has been very successful; and many other museums in the United States are following that system. Some people say such methods are dangerous, as they may cheapen the museum. But in fact they are part of the business, to use a vulgarism, of selling your goods to the people whom you know ought to buy them.

Among other problems in exhibiting works of art are, what are you going to do about the design of the show cases, and how are you going to place them? Then, again, are you going to have your galleries humanized by the use of furniture, carpets and a few flowers, or are they going to be cold and bare and official looking? Incidentally, the director of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge organized a band of twelve Cambridge ladies who undertook under solemn pledge to keep the Fitzwilliam Museum decorated with flowers and flowering plants throughout the year. Those galleries were humanized to a perfectly amazing extent and have been made really attractive and welcoming.

I think it is an important thing about a gallery that you should not only be able to see individual exhibits reasonably well, but you should feel the whole gallery is, as it were, taking you in and saying to you, "Come in, you are welcome." It is a small thing but I think the whole attitude of the guides in a gallery is of the greatest importance. On this side of the Atlantic there is an extraordinarily high standard of kindliness and civility. I can remember the days in the British Museum when if you began to look more than half a minute at an object a policeman suddenly appeared behind you, always prepared to leap on you if you made the least movement which might suggest the least intention of burglary or robbery. The whole atmosphere, in other words, was wrong. After all, a gallery partly belongs to the visitor. Why shouldn't one look at exhibits without a policeman standing behind to see that one does not look at them too long?

There are other things I might mention. How much does rearrangement in a gallery help? A visitor comes in and finds the picture he is fondest of moved from this corner to that corner, and says. "O, I have seen things in that picture and in that piece of sculpture that I never saw before because it is put in a new light." I do commend frequent rearrangement as a valuable means of gaining attention.

Then comes the question of labels. This is a difficult problem which nobody has really solved entirely satisfactorily. You want something not too conspicuous and also reasonably informative if you are going to help visitors: but too lengthy labels are apt to be boring and lead to people reading labels rather than looking at works of art.

Finally, there is the business of catalogues. Now, for a rapidly expanding gallery a catalogue is an expensive luxury. But it is a thing worth producing when a gallery attains first class rank. A good catalogue is a means of publicity, of letting people know you exist, quite apart from its indispensable function of giving information. Even a brief catalogue is far better than no catalogue at all. Expensive as it may be, yet it is again one of the means by which you put yourselves at the service of the public.

So it is with lectures—guide lecturing. I can remember when first introduced in Great Britain it was greeted with horror. People thought how unnecessary it was to have people go around and display works of art, how disagreeable to hear the human voice in a gallery. That point of view has now entirely disappeared. Today, my only criticism is that a great deal of guide lecturing is done by people who aren't paid enough, and as a result are not sufficiently well qualified. Explaining works of art in a gallery is a very difficult matter. I have done it a good deal myself many years ago, and I know if you are going to get the best out of this kind of service you have got to have people of first rate ability and pay them adequately.

I have said enough to show you, I hope, the great potentialities of service to your community that lie in an art gallery and something of the difficult problems which confront the administrators of the gallery if they are to do their job. It is a job that needs money, but I do hope that I have said enough at least to temporarily convince you it is a job worth doing and that properly conceived, properly administered and properly thought out, an art gallery can be one of the vital centres of life and civilization in the community's service. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Constable, on behalf of the members of the Club, and the audience which has been listening to you over the air, may I extend a very hearty vote of thanks. I am sure your remarks have given a complete answer to the question which is so often asked, "Why waste money on art galleries?"

The meeting is adjourned.

"A NORSEMAN DIED IN ONTARIO 900 YEARS AGO"

AN ADDRESS BY J. W. (JIM) CURRAN.

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, November 10, 1938

In view of the proximity of this meeting to Armistice Day, immediately preceding the introduction of the speaker, the President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C., asked the audience to rise while Dr. Cody offered the following prayer:

"O Lord, thou lover of souls, who through the mouth of the prophet of old hast declared that all souls are thine; we thank Thee for the brave and faithful dead who gave their service and their lives in the great struggle for righteousness, freedom and mercy. Grant that we may never forget the value and sacrifice of those who served and suffered or died for our country and Empire and the Cause. Forbid that their sufferings and deaths should be in vain; mercifully vouchsafe that, through their devotion and the firmness and wisdom of those who take counsel for our nation, the horrors of war may pass away from the earth, and Thy Kingdom of right and honour, of peace and brotherhood, may be established among men. Help us by Thy grace to be worthy of the sacrifice made for us, and afresh to give ourselves to do Thy will in the upbuilding of our land; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Immediately following the prayer, a minute of silence was observed, followed by the singing of the National Anthem, and the drinking of the "Toast to the King."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Prime Minister, Honourable Ministers, Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Christopher Columbus discovered America in 1492. Many generations have used that sentence in answering the obvious question. I think that before this meeting closes there will be serious doubts in your minds regarding the accuracy of the answer which we ourselves give.

Mr. James W. Curran, who is to speak to us today, is the Editor and Publisher of the Sault Ste. Marie Star. Many people, no doubt, think of Mr. Curran only as the vigorous defender of the good name of the once ferocious wolf. Actually, he is a serious student of early Canadian history and it was due largely to his interest and support that the Jesuit Missions to the Hurons were brought to public attention in such a comprehensive way. His interest in the Norse warrior, whose sword was found after 900 years by a prospector seeking gold near Beardmore on the north shore of Lake Superior, about 127 miles east and north of Port Arthur, has attracted much attention. If Mr. Curran's theory is established, and he is confident it will be, he will have made a contribution to the history of this country.

Mr. Curran takes as his subject, "A Norseman Died in Ontario 900 Years Ago"—four centuries before the coming of Columbus. I have much pleasure in introducing to you, James W. Curran. (Applause)

MR. JAMES W. CURRAN: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I once read that a gentleman was a person who, knowing all about a subject, listened with great courtesy to another who didn't know anything about it. I am sure I can depend on your indulgence this afternoon.

What I want to speak to you about is early Norse activity, say about a thousand years ago in America. I want to speak about the significance of it and I hope everybody will understand me. My store teeth don't work very well, once in a while. As a matter of fact sometimes I am not sure whether I understand what I am saying myself.

Now, the reason I got into this thing was because up in the Soo they say I have a propensity for foregathering with Indians. That is quite true. I am never very far from an Indian band. We have 700 right alongside the Soo, and it is quite natural that I should be interested in the Indian language and the Indian habits and early Canadian history, because the Indians are, of course, mixed up very thoroughly with our Canadian history.

This Norse business was pretty much an accident with me. For very many years I have been reading about the Indians and I have always been interested because Orillia, where I was brought up, was the centre of the old Huron nations which were wiped out by the Iroquois. Naturally enough when I moved to other places I kept up that interest.

Well, Indian words always bother me, the descriptive names of places, Toronto, Ottawa, Niagara, and so on. There was one word I ran across in Champlain's stuff. It was "mistigoche." Of course, that worried me terribly. I tried it on the Algonquins, the Ojibways, the Ottawas and two or three minor tribes. Finally, I was up in the Montreal River this summer, and Kenny Ross, the contractor, mentioned that he had a Cree Indian there. I said, "I want to see the Cree for a minute." He brought him over, and he was a very bright chap. I asked him about the word "mistikose." He said it was a Cree word all right and that is what they call the white man. From that I became interested in the fact that it was a Cree word, a Moose Cree, not a Swampy Cree or a Prairie Cree, and after I got through the whole thing I was perfectly satisfied it was the first name invented in America for the white man, and that it had been invented by a little band of Indians living at the mouth of the Moose River. There is no question in my mind that that was their original word in America for the white man. I have talked to a number of gentlemen who like this kind of thing. None of them so far disagree with me. I hope none of you will.

Just for a minute, look at the map behind us. The Viking age lasted from about 800 to 1100. During that time the Norwegians and the Danes expanded with terrific national vigour, and they put a King on the English throne, you remember, and conquered pieces of Spain and Europe and then got over as far as Constantinople. Among other things they went up by Iceland and got there in 850. Finally, Iceland got so overcrowded that they decided it wouldn't be a bad idea if they moved somewhere else. A man by the name of Eric the Red, got into trouble through killing another man. Then he was banished for three years and he decided to go west and he found Greenland. That was, they say, in 982. He came home after three years banishment and told such a whale of a story about this place that he had called Greenland, that he induced quite a number of people to go there, and finally, about three thousand people lived there.

Those figures are given by Mr. Poul Norlund, the Curator of the Danish National Museum at Copenhagen, who has been in charge of the research work in Greenland, digging out old archaeological remains since 1921. He has written very voluminous books about it. The Librarian at the Toronto University tried to get them for me, but they were too heavy to carry. There is a smaller book and if you are very much interested you can go up and get an armful of stuff about it.

Shortly after that, a man by the name of Biarni came over to Greenland from Norway to visit his father and he was blown out of his course, as King Olaf's saga says, for many days. He finally saw land. There is no description of it but there is a description of his return, and without worrying you about details, I will say it fits James Bay district.

My whole theory is this: The Icelandic settlers who went to Greenland were finally starved out of the land. There were about three thousand of them, and the last news heard from Greenland was in 1410. Nobody ever saw anything alive there after that until the middle of the next century, about 1541, when a fellow by the name of Jon Greenlander, an Icelander, landed there. He found a man dead there, all sewed up in the frieze clothes they used to wear there. It was figured he was the last Greenlander left alive in that colony.

In 1342 there were two colonies in Greenland—the Western Colony and the Eastern Colony. The Eastern Colony was on the south end, on the tip of Greenland. The Western Colony was about 350 miles farther north.

A priest went up there, hearing that the westerners had rather slipped from Christianity and he couldn't find them at all. That was in 1342. The entire settlement of approximately a thousand people had disappeared and was never heard of from that day to this. I figure, from one or two things, that they left for James Bay and went inland. Vinland was nothing else but the Great Lakes area. We have, of course, to produce pretty solid proof for that so the public will accept it, but I don't think it is a hopeless task at all.

What definite proof have we for saying that the Vinland of the sagas is the Great Lakes area? It is a curious thing but there has never been an authentic Norse indication found on the Atlantic coast. On the other hand, in the Great Lakes area you can point to several that we have. In the first place, the Crees of the Moose River, invented the first American name for the white man. The word is spelled as though it were "wamistikose." The principal root words are "mistik," meaning wood, and "oose," meaning boat or ship, and the word has been shortened to "mistikose."

The Ojibways, the Algonquins and the Ottawas still retain the original full form of "wamistikose," though they spell it "wemistigoche."

They guess that the first syllable means one of two things, that it either refers to the whiteness of the sails or to the movement of a ship in sailing. They don't know which. An Indian is always a little bit uncertain about things anyway. You have to help him make up his mind. Now, the curious thing about this name is that the Moose Crees themselves have shortened this word to "mistikose," and all the other Indian tribes in North America, certainly north of the St. Lawrence, use the old word, the original Cree word.

The Swampy Crees lived on Hudson's Bay, say anywhere from 200 to 350 miles north of the Moose Crees. The Swampy Crees have a different name for the white man. They don't use the word "wamistikose." They use the word "akuyasew," and that is from their word "akwayasew," which means he comes sailing, he sails to land, he is blown to shore. That is the word they use 250 miles north.

England is known to the Swampy Crees of Hudson Bay as "ukamuske," or land across the water. But the Moose Crees of James Bay call it "wemistikose wuske," or wooden boat land. I don't think there is any question in anybody's mind but that both sections recognize the original white man as coming from the sea. I think that is a fair deduction.

Archdeacon Faries, an educated man, who has been an Anglican missionary at York Factory for forty years, among the Swampy Crees, says the word applies to any white man or any European country. So we are entitled to say it originally applied to the Norsemen.

Here is another one. James Edward Dodd found the armour of a Norseman seven miles from Lake Nipigon in 1930. The armour has been pronounced of 11th century make by Dr. Currelly and other scholars so we may be fairly sure this is correct.

Now, I spent several weeks in finding what the facts were about this thing, because when I arrived in Port Arthur, I hadn't found anyone who believed that they were genuine Norse relics. By the time I got through everybody accepted it. So I think we can take Mr. James Edward Dodd, as an honest man, telling the exact truth when he says he found the sword, the handgrip of a shield and a battle axe exactly where he says he did. I went out with him there. The relics were found in front of a white quartz vein a foot wide, running up to a white dyke twelve feet high. There is no question that they were put there at that place because of the white vein, so the man who put them there could come back and find them.

In Minnesota in 1898 there was a Runic stone found, the Kensington stone. The inscription on this stone told that 8 Goths and 22 Norwegians, had arrived at that place, and I think ten of their number had been killed by an attack by somebody—it didn't say who—and the year on the stone was 1362.

The Norseland relics were found by Dodd at this point (using the map). There were several favourite routes south from James Bay up till the railroad era. The Ottawa, the Sturgeon into Lake Nipissing, and the Spanish into Lake Huron were all in use for ages. Then to travel west from James Bay, the Albany was the easiest northern route to Lake Nipigon, Lake Superior and Lake Winnipeg. The Norsemen came down an old route which runs very close to the place Dodd's armour was found. There is no question at all what happened. They were following an old trail. The Norseman died there and they buried him because it was too much trouble to take him further. You can see where they could take the Albany River and get out to Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. No trouble about it. I haven't gone over all of it myself, but it is a very easy route and it is the one the Hudson's Bay Company has always used.

Then they got into Lake Manitoba and went down the Red River. Then there were four Norse axes found in Minnesota, three of them within twenty or thirty miles of each other.

Then, down in Wisconsin they found a Norse spear. I want you to take note of this. We hear a lot about stuff being planted. The distance between these places is 360 miles. What a patient, plodding planter the man who planted that was! How hard he worked at it just to fool you and me. The average fellow who pulls off a joke likes to wait around the corner and see how it comes off. All this fellow wanted to do was his duty and run.

I brought down today to show Dr. Currelly a spear we found near the Soo on August 30th. He is doubtful about it—naturally. If other pictures of Norse spears are right, then this is a Norse spear. It is the same thing. This spear was picked up twelve miles from Sault Ste. Marie, on the shore of Lake Superior at the foot of a big sandstone bluff a hundred feet high, and the joker who planted this thing was a little careless about it. Unfortunately, he went around the bluff a little bit, where the waves of Lake Superior couldn't get a good crack at it and he buried it on top of a rock ledge, only a foot below the water and the weapon became covered with coarse sand and rubble. All two boys had to do was to lift a stone up, and they found the little tip of this thing looking at them. Finally, after a lot of work they dug the spear out and brought it to the Star Office. You may like to see this, but don't keep it, for Heaven's sake. I am sure the Doctor will agree with me after a while that it is Norse.

Here is another thing. The word "Tomahawk" is used all over America for an Indian war axe. You know where that came from? It is a corruption of the Cree word "Otamuwhuk," and "I strike him" is the meaning of the word. So you fellows who are good guessers, take a crack at that. How did that come? How was it this Cree word spread all over America? The Moose Crees were a small tribe and from them came the standard name for white man. I don't know, I am not suggesting the Norsemen spread it. After all when we talk about the Norse penetration of America everybody guesses and I think we are as much entitled to take a guess as anybody else.

Now, it is a very curious thing that Hudson Bay and James Bay answer better than any location the description in the sagas as to where Vinland was. The Norse sailed southwest from Greenland, and to Vinland, and if you strike southwest from Greenland you will hit within 70 miles of the shore of Labrador from Hudson Strait south. There is not a thing there but big stones, and there is no vegetation.

The Encyclopedia Britannica thinks it "strange" that navigators following Leif to Vinland could always find his "hut" without trouble. It is more than strange if it were located on the Atlantic coast, unless they coasted close to the shores all the way from Greenland for the 2,000 miles to the most southern area, favored by the experts. But if we locate Leif's house at the mouth of the Moose River, for instance, it would be easy. All that was necessary in that case to tell a new ship captain was to keep on till he reached the bottom of James Bay and then turn west till he came to the mouth of the Moose which he couldn't miss.

I am just giving you fellows some arguments in case you feel that way. No sailor could possibly mistake the saga's description of the place where this hut was located. It says, "the trees are back a long way from the water." It is exactly the description of all that shore from Moose Rriver to the Albany River. A friend of mine was up there and a couple of weeks ago he wrote that you could stand on the shore there today and when the tide goes out you can hardly see the water. The ebb tide leaves a bare shore a mile or more wide. It is flat land. I think probably when you go up you will find that condition, namely when the tide goes out you can't see water at all.

Now, the "skin boats" seen by Karlsefni were of course Eskimo kyacks. That is to say they were seen on James Bay which the Eskimos have frequented as visitors as long as the white man has known them. The Moose Cree Indians expelled them and the memories of the old hostilities still are green at Moose Factory. It was not the Indians but the Eskimos that the first Hudson's Bay Co. men most feared, and it was the Eskimos they had to put up defences against, not the Indians at all. As a matter of fact, Sam Chappice, of Moose Factory, tells me they never got along with the Eskimos. He said, "The Iroquois used to come up and kill us and then we got mad and went up north and killed the Eskimos." The Eskimos used to come down and kill Crees. These "skin boats" were kyacks. There is no record of a Canadian Indian, that I ever heard of and I have read a lot about them, ever using anything but a bark canoe, or canoes hollowed out of logs.

Then there is a lot of puzzling over the "self sown wheat" that the sagas speak of. That puzzles people. And the grapes puzzle people. Well, if you look in the 11th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica (Vol. 17, page 584) you will read there that grapes are indigenous to Manitoba. That is what it says in the Encyclopedia Britannica. And there is no question at all, but that this "self sown wheat" was common, ordinary prairie grass. It looks like wheat until it matures—so I am told by the experts. Still, those two things have puzzled people ever since the sagas were written and if they just had looked in the Encyclopedia Britannica they wouldn't have anything to worry about.

In the first place it was easy to get out to Lake Winnipeg. It was easy to get to Lake Nipigon. It is very easy to get to Lake Superior. No trouble at all. Going to James Bay down the Albany if you have not an Indian to paddle, let it drift and you will get there eventually.

So these Norsemen, you see, were up there much longer than the French have been in Canada. The Norsemen knew Ontario longer than the Frenchman has known Canada. Does anybody here say a Norseman, especially the old Norseman, was less enterprising than our Frenchman, as far as exploring and having a kind of rough time goes? I don't think anybody would say that. The whole history of the Norseman has been that of vigorous explorers and navigators, and willing to take anything they wanted. So I think we can give the Norsemen credit for probably doing as much as either you or I would. And I don't think any two men in this audience would be satisfied to sit down at Moose Factory or any place on Hudson Bay and not explore the ground around them. I don't think any two men in this room would do that. They would say, "Let us go west and find out, it must be a little different and it will be an enjoyable trip anyway." These fellows did it, thirty of them, and in 1362 they were out at this place where the Kensington stone was found, about the middle of Minnesota.

Here you have got these four axes and the spearhead, all out there in a territory of 360 miles. You have grapes that are indigenous to Manitoba. I don't know whether they are to Minnesota but probably they would be because the Red River Valley is supposed to be probably the most fertile land on earth. Minnesota, you know, is the greatest wheat-growing State in the Union. The whole picture fits in.

Here is a very odd thing about the word "bison." In 1027, not very long after the first Norseman came into Ontario, the King of Norway (this is in the sagas) built a warship and called it "The Bison." I would like somebody to guess why that was. Where did he get this name from? That is the American buffalo.

After reading all the records, the best scheme is to go and pay a place a visit if you want to write about it. I never could believe Champlain's account that on the French River, which is sixty miles long, there were not more than ten arpents of good land on its banks. That is what he says in his records of 1615. I paddled down it and I was surprised to see that it was correct. The only land worth talking about is the golf course at the C.P.R.'s bungalow camp. I think that instead of so many of us writing a great deal of matter before we pay a personal visit to these places, if we would do a little digging first we wouldn't make quite so many mistakes. Up in Algoma now and in Northern Ontario we are getting everybody relic conscious. Just a couple of days ago some one brought in a French sword and the Encyclopedia and some other authorities say this sword was made in 1650. It was picked up between the Spanish River and the mouth of the Mississagi.

Speaking of grapes the Professors have made many guesses. Professor Fernald, as an authority in the Encyclopedia Britannica, says that they weren't grapes. This gentleman is a chemistry professor in Harvard. He says they weren't grapes but were mountain cranberries. Mountain cranberries only grow in two states—Georgia and Virginia. They don't grow anywhere else. I want you to consider my guess—the Encyclopedia Britannica says that grapes are indigenous to Manitoba.

I would like to introduce my friend, Dan MacDonald. Dan was born in Algoma. He is a woodsman extraordinary. Dan travels with me to keep me straight on several things.

Thus the sagas make it pretty clear that Vinland extended from an area inhabited by the Eskimos at least as far as a place where there were grapes and prairie grass, say Manitoba and Minnesota on the west, the shore of Lake Huron on the south, the Ottawa River on the east, and as far north as the Albany River. That is the Great Lakes area.

I am afraid I am boring you stiff with this thing. This happens to be one of my little hobbies. It is a harmless little hobby, isn't it? It doesn't do anybody any harm. This, and chasing wolves, and a few other things like that. I know the average man doesn't care two hoots about this kind of thing. I was talking to a friend about the Indians a while ago and he turned around, he had been listening to me in a bored way, and he said, "Oh, who cares anything about what the Indians ever did or thought?" Possibly these folks feel that way about it.

Now, it won't be surprising if there are many more evidences of Norse penetration found in this part of the country. I will tell you something. A man has written from the north shore of Lake Nipigon that he has found a Norse relic there. I haven't had a chance yet to go over to see him and to find what proof he can offer. He seems a reasonable, intelligent person and he makes this claim. We have other claims from the north, east, south and west, and I presume, like the wolf claims, they will blow up. We should get everybody in our communities to be relic conscious and look in places where they should be found, such as lake shores and river shores, attractive camping grounds, any place you would camp yourself. That is the place to look and my impression is you are going to find Norse relics a long way south of Lake Nipigon.

There is another thing. King Olaf's saga speaks of Leif Ericsson's party and says, "They did not want for salmon; both in the river and in the lake; and they thought the salmon larger than they had ever seen before." I wonder if you have ever tackled salmon fishing on Lake Nipigon and Lake Superior? I never fished myself but I have been told there are the finest fish in the world there.

I am one of the trusting kind of souls, you know. All editors are. They like to tackle other people's problems. I like to believe a thing until there is some sense in not believing it. The woods are full of people who like to believe the other way. Let us take the joker who peddled the relics all over the Great Lakes area. I think you will admit to start with that he was a pretty funny kind of character. This man, whoever he was, or people, whoever they were, planted nine Norse relics in different parts of the country and they did it so well that it is just a miracle that you and I ever found them. And one was planted so well that a big tree grew on top of the relic to clasp it in its roots and others were shoved so deep in the ground that it was unreasonable to expect you or I to find them. That was done very long ago and the planter wasn't waiting around to see who would find the thing and have a laugh on them.

A gentleman over in London, the assistant keeper of the British and Mediaeval Antiquities in the British Museum, says the Kensington stone is a "forgery." Probably it doesn't incriminate anybody to believe it isn't, but it does throw some little bit of something or other on the University Professors who spent twenty years investigating the Kensington stone. My friend, Mr. Holand, of Ephraim, Wisconsin, wrote a book, a very big book, and he convinced me of the genuineness of the stone.

Anyway this planter of relics was such an energetic fooler that he covered 360 miles there in Minnesota and Wisconsin and he did it all before there were any aeroplanes, cars, or even roads. Now, gentlemen, you know that to cover 360 miles in a rough new country is quite a job, and the fellow must have had a terrific sense of the ridiculous to keep it up for that long. He didn't stop there. He came over to Ontario, and you know what he did here. I think the joker must have been Dodd's Norseman. You see what this fellow did. He dug a hole, put an axe and a spear and a shield in it and then he crawled in himself.

Here is the only thing that puzzles me. I know there must be an explanation if only we can think of it. But here is the one place where the joker fell down. He forgot to arrange with the Cree Indians not to invent the first American word for the white man. You see, a joke is just like a crime. You can't plan it too carefully.

I hope, gentlemen, this hasn't bored you, that I haven't ruined your afternoon. I conclude with a couple of words in Ojibway—"Neezh kewaedoog, nin mah moo ya wah, kiche." That means, "O Friends, I thank you very much." (Applause)

The President: Mr. Curran, far from boring us, you have kept us keenly interested in the possibilities of further search in our own districts and in other parts of the province. I am sure that many here will now agree with what I said in my opening remarks, and now they will not be too sure that Columbus discovered America. Thank you very much, Mr. Curran.

(Applause)

"DEMOCRACIES AND EXHIBITIONS"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ELGIN

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, November 17, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: My Lord, Sir William, Gentlemen of The Empire Club: This is the week of the Royal Winter Fair and we are privileged to have as guests at our head table today the Captains of some of the visiting Army Teams. Unfortunately, the Captain of the Chilean Team is ill and cannot attend, but I purpose introducing to you the various Captains who are sitting at the head table. First, we have Captain Camilo Chavez, of Cuba. (Applause) Then we have Captain Daniel Corry, of Eire. (Applause) You will have noticed in the press that Captain Arnando Dillarreal, of the Mexican Team, sustained a fall last night and is confined to hospital. He is ably represented by Lieutenant Zaoet, who has just stood before you. (Applause) Then, from our "good neighbour," we have Major John T. Cole. (Applause) And, finally, we have the Captain of the Canadian Team, which is acting as host this year, Captain Stuart C. Bate. (Applause)

I do not think I should close the introductions without reminding you (though this is not an introduction) that we are honoured today by having as our guest at the head table that ever-youthful Canada's "grand old man," Sir William Mulock. (Applause)

Canadians have a particular interest in our guest of honour, the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine, because his great grandfather, Lord Durham, and his grandfather, the Earl of Elgin, each filled the office of Governor-General of this country. It was during his grandfather's term that the Parliament Buildings at Montreal were burned by a group of rioters, and the Earl narrowly escaped serious injury. I hasten to assure His Lordship that Canadians have changed and it is our hope that instead of dodging missiles during his present stay he will feel he is among his "ain folk."

His Lordship is the tenth Earl of Elgin and Kincardine. He was educated at Eton and Oxford and served with distinction in the Great War. He is His Majesty's Lieutenant of the County of Fife. The list of high offices which he has held and many of which he still holds shows he is most keenly interested in the welfare of his fellowmen. He is a Director of the Royal Bank of Scotland, and he is the President of the Scottish Development Council and President of the Empire Exhibition at Glasgow. He was Grand Master Mason of Scotland from 1921 to 1924 and he was Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland from 1925-26 But His Lordship's visit to Canada is in no way connected with any of the high offices which he holds. Instead, he is here as one who is deeply interested in farming and in livestock, to act as a Judge of cattle at the Royal Winter Fair. It is my honour to introduce to you, Gentlemen, the Right Honourable The Earl of Elgin and Kincardine. (Applause)

THE HONOURABLE THE EARL OF ELGIN: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I wish to thank you immediately for the very kind and warm welcome which you have given to me this afternoon. Your President has spoken of the extremely warm welcome given on one occasion to my grandfather, but I can truthfully say that the welcome that you have given to me ever since I landed at Montreal on Saturday morning has been no less warm and no less enthusiastic, though perhaps in a different way to that which he received.

It has always been an inspiration to me that my grandfather and great grandfather were definitely connected with the building up of Canadian history and that my father was born in Montreal. One of the first things that I did on landing on this occasion was to take my eldest daughter to see the place in which her grandfather was born, the room in which he first saw light. So coming on today to Toronto it is quite right and fitting that your Chairman should remind me that my official duties are the humble but the interesting ones of being a judge of cattle. But so enthusiastic and so hospitable has been your welcome that I have not yet been able to get down to work.

With that history I do feel there is a duty upon one to carry on that tradition so far as one can, so far as one is able to carry on that tradition and keep the interest between this great Dominion and the Mother Country and no one, I feel certain, can board one of the steamers of the C.P.R. or any other line which operates between this continent and our country, and land as we did at Montreal, without a feeling of admiration for those who set out in the early times—Champlain, Cabot and Jacques Cartier and many others, who set out in their small ships not knowing exactly where they were going—but as the result of that energy and enterprise we see today the great Dominion of Canada. Further, no one can board one of the steamers of the present day and land in Montreal without a feeling of great gratitude also for the efficiency and comfort of these present services.

On this particular visit that we are making, we came by way of the St. Lawrence and we actually touched at Father Point at eleven o'clock on the 11th of November, and there was in the minds and in the hearts of everyone on board the Duchess of Atholl, a feeling of intense and deep gratitude, not only for the safe journey which had been accomplished, but for the courage, inspiration and service of the past and a great gratitude for peace.

In these anxious times that we are now living in it would be improper of me, coming as I do as a visitor to your country, to indulge in anything in the way of advice on the political question, but undoubtedly there are before us great issues which each one of us as individuals and as members of the community must realize and face up to. No one who was present in any of our big cities on the other side and more particularly in London, can have failed to be impressed with what took place at the end of September. We had trenches dug in our parks. Part of our underground railway system was shut up in order that it might be properly prepared as a protection base for refuge. We had the issue of gas masks. We had our windows blocked and sandbagged and we took part in that kind of operation at the same time realizing that the preparations, impressive, large and effective as they were up to a point, were terribly short of what they should have been. We were brought face to face with a realization of the very near proximity of a world war. I think that two things which we realized out of that, the two things that came uppermost to our minds when we were faced with that were: Are we really a civilized people? Is there a God that judges the world? Are we to let loose all these forces of pandemonium or can we live together with our neighbours in peace?

That was the real issue before us and at that time a move was taken which, though we may not agree with all that was said and all that was done then, and all that has followed, still was a move for which we cannot but be thankful and grateful deep down in our hearts. It was a move of personal contact, personal contact of the responsible statesmen, in the person of the Prime Minister himself, who flew to the other country, to Germany, to make personal contact with the Fuehrer, with Herr Hitler, and by so doing he made that personal contact with the Dictator, but he did a great deal more. He made personal contact with the German nation. (Applause) And I do think, Gentlemen, that it is a most remarkable thing and perfectly certain that not only in this country, not only in Great Britain and France, but in Germany, there is a very large body of public opinion who really are intent and determined on peace.

(Applause)

Gentlemen, one cannot help admiring the efficiency with which Germany has marshalled itself during the past five years. One cannot help admiring the way in which the preparation of machines and materials has been made. One cannot help feeling that there is something wonderful in the way in which the nation and its spirit have risen to the occasion, but even now, after the crisis has passed I think we must still remain anxious. Anxious, yes, but as I said a few moments ago, there were two dominant thoughts in our minds and the second was: Is there a God that judges the earth?

God moves in a mysterious way. We cannot understand but we do feel in our country, and I am sure you feel also in Canada, as in many other nations of the world, if we hold fast to the great commandment to love God and love our neighbour, we shall eventually come right and we shall not be ashamed. (Applause) The crisis will help us. It will help us in this way, I think, certainly on our side of the Atlantic, and possibly on this side also, there has been a tendency in recent times for the large majority to stand by as spectators. They are quite happy so long as the work is done and they are quite happy to look on and see it being done, but I do feel that the crisis has made us face these things and has revealed a new spirit in the nation, a new spirit of wishing to do, each one his share in the service of the state. I think that this new spirit has also been extended to bring together those nations who think alike and whose governments are democracies. It has helped to bring them closer together, to understand one another toward making for the ultimate end. What is the ultimate end? Not to build up a vast defence protection, not to build large vessels of destruction, not to build up an army and create an air force. Those are the means to the end. The end is fuller, freer trade between the nations, commerce and mutual help, and out of that a freer, fuller and better life for the individual and the state.

(Applause)

In thinking out what I should say to you today I looked back in some of my grandfather's papers and I came across this rather striking note in a letter from him to Lord Grey, which happens to be dated the 8th of November, 1849 — almost exactly ninety years from today: "You have a great opportunity before you. Obtain reciprocity for us and I venture to predict that you will be able shortly to point to this hitherto turbulent colony with satisfaction, in illustration of the tendency of self-government and freedom of trade to beget contentment and material progress. Canada will remain attached to England, though tied to her neither by the golden links of protection or by the old-fashioned method of colonial office jobbing and chicane."

How true is that today.

I have just come, as your Chairman indicated, from an effort which we have made this year in Scotland, an effort of bringing together the different parts of the Empire in order to show how those different parts can act together, pull together as an influence for good and peace in the world, to show how one can help the other by making up the deficiencies, and I would like to acknowledge, here and now, the very great help given to me, both personally, by the High Commissioner, Mr. Vincent Massey, and also by the Dominion of Canada, in the representation which we had in the Empire Exhibition in Glasgow. Canada's lead helped the other Dominions to take part in this Exhibition and quite properly, her pavilion not only was about double the size of the other Dominions, but was placed in the middle of the Dominion Avenue. So I should wish to thank the Dominion for all the help which they gave in making the Empire Exhibition of Glasgow a worthy exhibition, an exhibition which showed the vigour and life which came from all the different parts of this great Empire to which we belong, and which put them in one picture before the people of England and Scotland and all the visitors whom we were able to entertain there, in a way that has never been seen since the big Exhibition at Wembley, and we are satisfied—I speak with humility—we are satisfied that we gave a better show than they had at Wembley. I think it is not without justice that I should say so because on our last day of the Exhibition, the 28th of October, we had within the gates 364,092 people, which exceeded the highest record for a day's attendance at Wembley by something like 40,000.

Now, it is perhaps an impertinence of me to speak of exhibitions in Canada because you have realized for so long what the force of an exhibition can be, what good it can do in being a point of contact and in promoting trade and commerce. I have had great encouragement from the number of people who have said to me, "We are glad that we took part, that we took a stall in a pavilion in Glasgow. We have made interesting new contacts." Well, you have appreciated that for years in Canada and I should like again to quote from my grandfather to that effect. In saying farewell to Montreal in 1854, he used these words: "I shall remember the energy and patriotism which gathered in this city specimens of Canadian industry from all parts of the province for the World Fair, and which has been the means of rendering this magnificent conception of the illustrious Consort of our beloved Queen more serviceable to Canada than it has perhaps proved to any of the other of the communities which have been represented there."

That showed that in 1854 that spirit of enterprise was alive in Canada which is seen now year after year in the great Exhibition which you hold in this city in the month of August. I have never yet had the opportunity of visiting that fair, but for the last two years the Scottish Development Council, of which I am President, has had a stall there and we know that it has been a benefit to us to have this link with the great fair in Toronto.

Well, in our Exhibition we have tried to associate history and development to give a visible demonstration of what the Empire is and what it can do. We had our Art Pavilion and in the Art Pavilion there was a collection which I think stands in history as unique as a collection of Scottish art in different ages. We had our two Palaces of Industry, and we tried to associate in them, and in the great pavilion put up by the United Kingdom, what science and research can do to help the lives of the citizens and the lives of the community; for instance, to show how by a study of food values health can be improved without bringing in the doctor; and to show how the lot of the coal miner can be improved and what are the wonderful by-products of coal in giving heat and light to the community.

We had steel in various forms, showing how science has produced the various forms from an ingot of steel down to the most expensive form of steel, the hair-spring of a watch, and a comparison of the cost of a ton of those different forms of steel. Those are the kinds of pictures which are interesting and mark progress.

Then we had our hall of shipping, which was fitted with every implement of modern science and was commanded by an ex-Commander of the C.P.R., Captain MacQueen. Finally, at the end of this great pavilion we had a magnificent globe of blue depicting the earth floating in space. It was not apparent how it was supported, but there it floated and revolved, showing the different parts of the Empire, and the firmament studded with innumerable stars and having the gauzy, fleecy clouds floating in space throughout the atmosphere. That pavilion was one which always attracted attention and there was nearly always a queue waiting to get in.

But apart from these things which we tried to show we gathered in our Exhibition a number of conferences: One of the largest of these was an international conference of engineers which was presided over by Lord Weir. Their meeting covered two days and they had a long agenda, but in his opening remarks Lord Weir said something to this effect: It is almost a tragedy to think how the best brains of engineers and of other scientists have been turned recently to think out weapons of destruction and death and how much better it would be if we could only turn those brains and that energy into the line of bringing something more of peace, something more of comfort into the life and activity of the human race.

It certainly was a striking speech and it was a note which I think we must all take to heart. It is a tragedy that we should be employed now in this year thinking out weapons of destruction, weapons for dealing death, but undoubtedly, if we are to uphold the principles of justice, the principles of truth, we must be able to defend ourselves.

I can remember at the time when I served as private secretary to my father, when he held the office of Secretary of State for the Colonies, that I saw some of the papers which came through minuted by the various officials. There was one case which I remember of a delinquency on the part of some one who should have been looking after the fishermen's interests, I think it was, in Newfoundland. The file had grown to about this depth. There were minutes by junior officials, by senior officials, showing what had been done and what had not been done, but right across the top page of a closely written minute by the Permanent Under-Secretary, was one sentence written in neat handwriting in red ink, to this effect: A fishing guard who fails to guard fishing cannot fail to be regarded as inefficient. And the initials under that, also in red, were W.S.C.—Winston Churchill.

Well, Gentlemen, that is an illustration that I think we would do well to take to heart today. If a fishing guard fails to guard his fishing he must be regarded as inefficient. In the same way, if we fail to guard our proper responsibility we shall be regarded as inefficient.

But I would repeat what I said a few minutes ago, we must not take defence as the final thing. It is an urgent need today but not the ultimate end. Gentlemen, it is not the ultimate end, but we have before us a responsibility, a responsibility which is going to bring us nearer together in the different parts of this great Empire to which we belong. As in the case of the Prime Minister in the first step which he took, personal contact was the thing that mattered, so personal contact is the thing which matters today. First of all, each of us as an individual must take his share, but those who are responsible for the leadership must also by their personal contacts be able to influence the nation and the world at large. It is, I think, one of the most remarkable developments of science how one voice can now be heard by millions of people all over the world. I felt a great responsibility today when your President said to me, "Now you are on the air." It is a very great responsibility to me and so it is to each one who is called upon to speak in public. But if we compare, as I think we must compare, the kind of impassioned appeal to which I expect many of us have listened, over the waters from Herr Hitler, realizing the thousands whom he is addressing in that way, we cannot but feel that there is given to one man a tremendous power over the thoughts of his fellowmen, but I take comfort from this. I can remember, you can all remember, those talks to which we listened on Christmas evening which were given to us, year by year, by King George, the Fifth. He spoke as a father to his family and I venture to say that those words which he gave year by year, sitting in his chair at Sandringham, had a wider and a more lasting influence than the impassioned speeches of Herr Hitler. (Applause)

It is the personal contact which counts. Every one who turned on the dials on those occasions felt he was in the room with him. He was speaking to them as one who loved them and whom they loved.

Now, let me turn your thoughts back again once more to the farewell which was given by my grandfather to Quebec, when after eight years of strenuous work he left this Dominion and went back to his native home. In 1855 in a final speech at Quebec he said this: "I trust that I may hear from time to time of the steady growth and development of those principles of liberty and order, of manly independence in combination with respect for authority and law, of national life in harmony with British connection which it has been my earnest endeavour to implant and establish. I trust, too, that I shall hear that this House continues to be what I have ever sought to render it, a neutral territory on which persons of opposite opinions, political and religious, may meet together in harmony and may forget their differences for a season." (Applause) I could not help feeling when I read those words, is he listening today? I believe that all of us, and particularly, perhaps, those who leave the Mother Country and go to a new country, have a feeling of the value, the force of heredity and how it comes back, year after year, generation after generation, and I do believe that that spirit which he speaks of there in those words, which gives the opportunity of people of different opinions, whether religious or political, getting together and for a season forgetting those differences, is a spirit which is encouraged in this country. and on which a great deal depends.

Well, we have at this very moment a token of this kinship and friendship, from which very great results may follow and I, as the son of a Canadian, rejoice that Canada is to be the medium or, if I may say so, the keystone of the royal arch of this great rapproachement of the forces of democracy. (Applause) I rejoice, I know you rejoice and I rejoice with you in the thought that Canada next year is to have a visit from Their Majesties, the King and Queen. From personal knowledge of the kind of welcome which you give to a humble citizen like myself, I can foresee the burst of enthusiasm and welcome with which Their Majesties will be received when they arrive on this shore, and it will give them an opportunity, not only to get into personal contact with you, with their own subjects in this great Dominion, but it will give them the opportunity through your medium to get into contact with the great democracy to the south, the United States of America.

Canada has been for long the example of retaining individuality and at the same time demonstrating the importance of working together and living in harmony. We have in Canada the example of two traditions coming down in different streams with their own tradition, looking back to their traditions of home parentage, but with the same thoughts of loyalty to the country to which they belong. So I would repeat that I rejoice that Canada should have this opportunity of being the link of giving personal contact for our own King and Queen with the President of that great democracy, the United States of America. The one great thing of importance at this moment is that all these people like ourselves should act with a perfect understanding, a willingness to go together, hand in hand, in seeing that justice, honour and freedom are given effect to and respected. We cannot but look with anxiety when we see the flagrant way in which these things which we hold dear—freedom of speech, freedom of action—are disallowed in other countries, but here is an opportunity which is given to us each and everyone of us, whether citizens of England, Scotland, Canada, France or the United States, to join together, hand in hand, and heart to heart in an effort to show that freedom, truth and justice are what we stand for.

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: My Lord, it is not my intention to attempt to express in words the feelings which have been exhibited to you during the course of your remarks. I feel that I would spoil the atmosphere which has been created. I would, however, say this, that if the answer to your question, "I wonder if my grandfather is listening today?" is "Yes," then I suggest that he is now saying, "Well done." (Applause)

The meeting is adjourned.

"PALESTINE IN RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ALVAH L. MILLER

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Tuesday, November 22, 1938

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: Through the courtesy of the Toronto Young Men's Christian Association we are to have this opportunity of hearing an address by Mr. Alvah L. Miller, General Secretary of the Association in Palestine. As a matter of fact, Mr. Miller started his work in the United States and from there he went to India where he was stationed at Lahore, Delhi and Calcutta. He was transferred to Jerusalem in 1935 and has been in close touch with the various groups concerned with the present problem in Palestine, toward the solution of which the Government of Great Britain is devoting its best efforts today. I am sure that his views upon the situation will be of great interest. I have much pleasure in introducing Mr. Alvah L. Miller, whose subject will be "Palestine in Retrospect and Prospect." Mr. Miller. (Applause)

MR. ALVAH L. MILLER: Mr. President, Gentlemen of The Empire Club and Guests: It gives me very great pleasure to be back in Toronto after an absence of seven years. I have always enjoyed very much being in Toronto, and it is splendid to be back to meet old friends and make new ones. The last time I was here I had the privilege of speaking a few times regarding the situation in India and I think these days when we are so much concerned with serious problems around the world it is encouraging to note that one of the forward steps made in government during the last few years is in India. It has been splendid to note the way in which the people there have developed in their co-operation with the British people and of the much more satisfactory relationships existing today in that great land.

This afternoon I am going to invite your attention to another section of the world. Palestine is small in size and perhaps when we consider the great issues that are on in Europe and in the Far East, Palestine may seem to pale into insignificance. Yet, on the other hand, small as it is, almost insignificant in size, it is quite true that Palestine today is of intense interest to many people around the world, and I therefore make no apology in attempting to interpret something of the situation there.

In order to understand Palestine it seems to me we must go back in history. I know of no modern problem that has its roots so deeply embedded in history as does Palestine. Therefore, I invite you to think for a few moments of the history that leads up to our modern problem. Go back about 4,000 years to the second millennium, B.C., and you remember some tribes from the hinterland in Arabia moved west in search of pasture. We read in the Old Testament of one tribe or group of tribes, under the leadership of Abram, found their way across the desert to the interesting city of Damascus, supposedly the oldest continuously inhabited city in the world; then down the length of Syria to Palestine. We read that they pitched their tents under the oaks at Hebron. Then, several hundred years later we find the people now called Israelites, going across to Egypt, once again in search of food and for four hundred years they lived most of the time in bondage to the Pharaohs. Then a great leader, by the name of Moses arose. I sometimes feel that historians have never done justice to Moses, a man of great leadership, ability, character and certainly of great faith. We find him leading these discouraged, despondent, enslaved people out of bondage, over into Sinai where for forty years they lived in the desert, in preparation, I believe, for their return to their promised land. You have read the beautiful phrase in the Old Testament, as Moses stood in the mountain overlooking the Dead Sea and across to Palestine "he was gathered to his fathers."

Then Joshua stepped into the leadership, piloting them across the Jordan River and back into Palestine. It is important for us to notice, in passing, that immediately upon crossing the Jordan River and arriving at the little village of Jericho, they met opposition, and as they pushed their way further up the hills and across the plains to the Mediterranean, we find that opposition continuing.

Comparatively soon we find that Saul laid the foundation for the Empire upon which David built more firmly and which was more widely extended by his son, Solomon. That reign or rather that empire continued from about 1010 B.C. to 930 B.C., a period of some 80 years when the Israelites ruled and controlled the whole section of the country, not only modern Palestine and Syria, but the territory extended toward Egypt on the south, and out toward Babylon on the northeast. Then, we find following Solomon's death, a period of decline and for 200 years there was chaos throughout the country. This was an important period, however, for during these years the major prophets were giving to the world their great writings. In 721 B.C. the Assyrian Empire swept across that section of the world in its attempt to reach Egypt. The northern kingdom, with its headquarters in Samaria, was completely destroyed. The southern kingdom, with its headquarters in Jerusalem entered into treaty relationship with the invaders and for 200 years they maintained a semi-independent status. Then Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, in 585 conquered the Assyrians. He overran Palestine and this time Jerusalem was not spared. The city was destroyed and some 400,000 of the people of Jerusalem were taken in bondage back to Babylon. There, for some eighty years they were enslaved. Then Cyrus, the founder of the Persian Empire, gained control of that section of the world and one of his first acts was an act of clemency. He announced that those in bondage, the Jews as well as other peoples, might return to their respective places. Again, according to tradition, some 40,000 Jews made the long trek back to Jerusalem, once again to rebuild the walls and re-establish their ethical and cultural home.

Then, for two centuries we find the Persians ruling the country. Later Alexander, on his way out to India, established his rule and left his Greek generals in charge. Several centuries later the Roman legions are on the march. In 63 B.C., we find them entering Palestine, capturing the old city of Jerusalem and it was under the rule of the Romans that our Lord lived in Palestine.

In 70 A.D. Titus, the Roman general, completely destroyed the old city of Jerusalem, tore down the temple, destroyed the walls, and, according to Josephus, the historian of the day, "ploughed up the streets of Jerusalem."

Now, it is important to note, before we leave this point, that far back in those days Jerusalem was looked upon by the Jewish people as the centre of their cultural and religious hope. We remember reading in the Old Testament how the captives sat by the waters of Babylon and wept and how one of the great singers said, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its cunning." It is important to remember that that same spirit has animated the Jewish people around the world from that day on to the present. Jerusalem is their sacred city, their cultural and their ethical home.

Now, I have given in a very brief space an outline of one of the great chapters of human history; a chapter that I think you will agree ranks right up in importance with the chapters of Rome and the chapters of Greece. The Jewish people living in Palestine and that section of the world made two great contributions. One was their conception of God, developed from a very crude beginning into that great idea, summed up in those words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one." That was a tremendous step forward, a conception of one God—monotheism. Not only so but a God of ethical characteristics.

Now, it was my privilege to study something of Hinduism in India, and there are many fine, ethical conceptions in Hinduism. Their ideas were developing at the same time as those of the Jews in Palestine. But there is this difference: the Hindus were worshipping many gods. The Jews gave to the world that first great concept of one God, an ethical God, interested in us as individuals. The second great contribution, of course, was the inculcation of those ideas, those concepts, in the immortal prose and poetry, as we have it in the Old Testament today.

Now, let us look at the picture from another point of view for a moment, because like most of our problems in the world today, this picture in Palestine has two sides. Let us pick up another thread of history, this time of the Arab peoples. We read in Holy Writ that Seth, son of Noah, lived 600 years, and begat sons and daughters. Seth is called the first Semite. One of Seth's descendants was Abram, whom I mentioned a few moments ago. We find Abram had two sons, one called Ishmael, the son of Hagar, the Egyptian handmaiden; the other, Isaac, the son of Abraham's wife, Sarai, and 900,000 Arabs in Palestine today trace their lineage back to Ishmael.

Now, coming down to more recent history. In the 6th century A.D. a very important event occurred. Out in Arabia, in a little town called Mecca, some 350 miles from Jerusalem, a boy was born who was named Mahomed. He was destined to change the pages of history. This boy at an early age, we read, joined the caravans that in those days travelled back and forth between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. On the trips the little Arab boy must have learned something of the Jewish religion and the Christian religion, because in the Koran, the Bible of the Moslems, that he gave to the world later, he refers in appreciative terms to the Jewish religion, and of the founder of Christianity. Later, Mahomed, married a wealthy widow and so had time for thought and meditation. We find him sitting in Arabia, as so many Hebrews had sat in that section of the world, and he too felt called upon to deliver a new message. The scattered Arabians had not thought in terms of one God. Now we find Mahomed arriving at the conclusion, along with that of the Jews, that there is but one God, and his conception may be summed up in the phrase, "There is no God but God, and Mahomed is his prophet."

Now, something about Mahomed, his character, his leadership and ability, and certainly his message that he gave to the scattered Arab tribes, enabled him in a very few years to weld together the tribes in a new Arab nation. We see them sweeping across the Persian border, modern Iran, Irak, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, the whole of the north African coast and all Spain and Portugal. For 300 years the Arabs ruled and governed that entire section of the world, not only economically and politically, but culturally. Students from Europe came to sit at the feet of learned Arab scholars during the Dark Ages. The Arabs made a real contribution, especially in the realm of medicine, astronomy and mathematics.

Now, it is important to keep that in mind as we think of the Arab peoples today, because they are very proud of their past. They are very proud of their history, and certainly they have a right to be.

Then, coming down to more recent history, in 1517, we find the old Turkish Empire sweeping across that section of the world and for 400 years to the month, prior to Lord Allenby's entering Jerusalem, the Turks ruled and governed that section of the world.

Now, I suppose if you would look for an illustration of mal-administration, you would find your perfect example in that section of the world under the pre-war Ottoman Turks. The Arab people, we are told by people who lived there through the later years, had little opportunity for developing either economically or educationally. Had it not been for the Christian missions in this part of the world and Europe sending teachers and doctors over to that country, there would have been little in the way of development. They were held down economically. We are told if they bought a few extra sheep or a few extra goats or put a little more land in cultivation, they were taxed to an extra extent. So, we find considerable dissatisfaction with the Turkish rule, even though the Turks were Moslem, and a great majority of the Arabs were Moslem.

But coming to more recent events. In 1915, we find the Turks and the Germans pressing across that section of the world in an effort to get to the Suez Canal, that very important body of water that reaches out to Australia, India, and the Far East, and so particularly important to Britain. So we find Sir Henry MacMahon, the High Commissioner for Egypt, was asked by the Colonial Office to get in touch with the Sheerif of Mecca, later King Hussein of the Hedjas, to see if there was a possibility of stirring up a revolt among the Arab people against the Turks. You remember the story of T. E. Lawrence and "The Revolt of the Desert," how the Arabs did revolt, how they were promised, if they revolted against the Turks, after the war was over they would be given an independent national state. You remember how T. E. Lawrence led the revolt over that section of the world and led the Arabs into Damascus, as the Turks and Germans fled on to the northward.

I would say in passing that there has been some claim since, I think even Sir Henry MacMahon has said that they did not intend to include Palestine in the area promised for an Arab state. Be that as it may, the Arabs understood that it was, and that must be taken into consideration to get an accurate picture of the situation in Palestine today. We also know that T. E. Lawrence, because of his feeling that the British had not quite played fair with the Arabs, resigned from the British army.

Then in 1917 another promise was made, this time to the Jews. Dr. John Chaim Weizman, a Russian Jew, was teaching chemistry in Manchester University. He developed a new method of making an ingredient used in the manufacture of T.N.T., a high explosive. It was something very much needed by the Allies at that time, especially by Britain. He was asked, "What do you want in return for your new discovery?" Dr. Weizman, in magnanimous terms, said, "I want nothing for myself, but the Jews are interested in re-establishing in Palestine a cultural home, a religious home, and we would be glad to have the support of the Allies, particularly the British, in our ambition."

So we find a few weeks later, Lord Balfour stating what is called the Balfour Declaration, in which he said, "The British will look with favour upon the establishment in Palestine of a home for the Jews, it being understood nothing will be done which will prejudice the civil and religious rights of the already existing inhabitants." That was in 1917 and I suppose as we look back we can say that those two statements, the promise to the Arabs and the promise to the Jews, both made in good faith and both accepted in good faith, is the basis of our difficulties in Palestine today.

Shall we follow it through a bit more closely? At the end of the war there were probably in Palestine about 40,000 to 50,000 Jews. Some of them whom we speak of as Oriental Jews have been there for a great many years. Others have come in more recently, with the hope of re-establishing this cultural home in Palestine.

It is difficult to say how many Arabs there were—probably 700,000, both Christian and non-Christian. There are about 80,000 Christian Arabs in Palestine today. As the British took over the mandate in 1921, they attempted under a very able High Commissioner, Lord Samuel, to implement the conditions of the mandate; that is to establish in Palestine a home for the Jews, but at the same time to protect the interests of already existing inhabitants.

We find as we read the record that from the very beginning the Arabs objected. They said, "You have promised us an independent national state. Our country is small." It is about the size of Wales, or if you are familiar with the State of Vermont, slightly larger than Vermont. They said, "We are limited in resources, and we have not enough land as it is to go around. We object. We are afraid if the Jews come in large numbers, not only will we suffer economically but we will probably lose our country."

They may have been right; they may have been wrong. I am simply trying to give their point of view. Steadily, year by year, the Jewish immigration into Palestine arose, so that along in 1929 we had a serious outbreak, when a number of people were killed. Two Commissions came from England. One was the Shaw Commission, I think about 1928—I am not sure of the date—and the other, the Sir John Hope Simpson Commission, which came in 1930 or 1931. Both studied the situation and proceeded back to Parliament, by and large, approving of the contention of the Arabs that the country was too small for so large an immigration.

Sir John Hope Simpson, for instance, a very able man, made a study of the amount of available land, of good land and poor land in the hills, which your farmers in this land would scoff at for farming and they estimated how many acres it would take to support a family. Then they said, as they divided the acreage by the number of families already in Palestine, "There isn't room for a large immigration," but in 1933, in spite of that report, we find 35,000 people coming into the country. In 1934 we find 48,000; in 1935, there were 62,000 legal immigrants, and according to the High Commissioner, possibly another 20,000 came illegally over the borders and along the Mediterranean Coast. As we look back I suppose the reaction of the Arabs is just what we might expect. They were dominated by fear as they saw the great mass of people coming into their small country, and they said, "If this keeps up for another eight years we will be in the minority. When we are in the minority we will lose our homeland." They may have been right, they may have been wrong. That was the argument they presented.

So we find in April, 1936, the riots broke out. A rebellion started and it has been going from bad to worse ever since.

I should like to digress to say one or two words about the result of the immigration into Palestine. There have been, approximately 400,000 Jews that have come in in the last seventeen years. As you visit some of their colonies—I think I visited the great majority of them—as you visit their hospitals and schools, as you come to understand those splendid arrangements which the labour group has made for looking after sick people or men who need hospitalization, you see what a tremendous advance they have made in comparison to the other sections of the country. They have money, they have organization, they have intelligence, and they have leadership, and one is impressed with the fine work that has been done. But as one looks back one cannot help but feel, I think, that the tragedy of the present situation is that years ago leaders—particularly, I think, the Jewish people, because after all in comparison to Arab leadership it is so much better organized—they didn't insist on gathering people together and sitting down and talking things over and coming to an understanding as to what was going to happen in the country. Otherwise, how would it be possible to bring so many people into the country in such a comparatively short time and expect everything to go along happily and in a successful, a satisfactory manner. It could not be done in any other country so why should we expect it to work happily in Palestine.

Well, it is easy to criticize as one looks back. Our hindsight is always better than our foresight.

When the troubles continued seriously into 1937 the British sent out this time a Royal Commission, and I think, Gentlemen, I have never had the privilege of meeting a group of men so able, so efficient and so anxious to understand a situation as Lord Peel and his associates. Lord Peel was a remarkable man, and their report is indeed a masterpiece. If you haven't read it, may I recommend that you read it. It is a fine history of Palestine and well worth your study. Anyway, the Lord Peel Commission said in effect in its report back to the King, that the mandate has failed. We may as well admit, as a mandatory power, we have failed. We have attempted an impossible thing. There are two things we can do. We can hand the mandate and our trust back to the League of Nations, from which we have got it, and say we have failed and admit it, or we can attempt something else.

As you know the British way is to attempt something else. So they recommended that the country be divided into an Arab state, a Jewish state and a British sphere of influence. Well, most people, I think, that knew the situation felt that was an impracticable, an impossible solution, and so another Commission was appointed to go out to Palestine, and it has just reported back to Parliament, as you have seen, stating that the partition scheme is impractical. So we are back where we were before, with this difference, that they have recommended now what we all wish might have happened some years ago, the calling together of Jewish leaders and Arab leaders to sit down in London, with English officials, and try to work out some solution.

May I read just a few sentences from the opinion of a great Jewish leader in Palestine, one of the greatest men I think I have ever met—Dr. Magnus—and this is from a speech that he gave last year in August. He says: "It is incumbent upon the Jews to endeavour to come to terms with the Arabs." Later on he says: "The resolution that we propose today is that before any other step of whatever nature be taken, we charge our Committee with the task, if I may use the term, the sacred task of endeavouring to persuade all factors to sit down together to reason with one another and try to bring out a peaceful settlement in accordance with which Palestine, an undivided Palestine, shall not be an Arab state, a Jewish state, but an Arab-Jewish state, and shall expect to find itself in the course of the years under the tutelage of the greatest educating force, Great Britain."

I am perfectly sure Dr. Magnus is right. He went on in another address to say, "If the Jewish national home is always to be dependent on British bayonets it will never be a home worth living in." How perfectly sensible, and how obviously true! How regrettable that the leaders some years ago didn't see the importance of coming to some understanding, and thus allay the fears of the Arabs. There is no other solution, I am perfectly sure. There are 450,000 Jews in Palestine, there are 900,000 Arabs. But we must not forget that on three sides of Palestine, there are 30,000,000 Arabic speaking people, deeply concerned in the outcome. How to build in Palestine today a home that will be of any satisfaction to anyone unless some understanding is arrived at is simply beyond one's imagination. Thus the first essential for a home in Palestine for the Jewish people in my opinion is for some understanding to be arrived at with the Arab people. I believe myself that that is possible, though I will say we are some years too late. I should add that after two and a half years of turmoil and strife, Palestine is in a terrible economic situation. There is great poverty and large unemployment. Even more serious is the great chasm of hatred—hatred, the like of which I have never before experienced, that separates the two peoples in Palestine today. There is no dealing, one with the other, and the spirit of revenge and of hatred is so deep that at times one almost despairs of seeing the chasm bridged.

May I, in a few concluding moments, get on a more cheering subject. I haven't been very optimistic, but I have tried to give an accurate interpretation of the situation in Palestine.

We have in Jerusalem a modern Y.M.C.A. The money was provided by a Christian businessman in New Jersey, who saw in 1921 the hope of establishing there an institution where Christian and Moslem, Arabs and Jews, as well as people coming from all over the world might meet on a basis of goodwill and co-operation.

I wish, Gentlemen, remembering what I have said about the difficulties in Palestine, you might step into our building tonight. It is one of the most beautiful buildings, I suppose, so far as the Y.M.C.A. is concerned, in the world, and there you will find thirty-three nationalities. There is no other Y.M.C.A., I believe, that can equal this claim—thirty-three nationalities. And I am proud to say that all during the difficult days when out on the streets there was riot, bloodshed, arson, murder and strife, in the dormitories and in the swimming pool and in the gymnasium, in the night classes, in the concerts and in the orchestras, there have been Jews and Arab Christians and Moslems working together and playing together and at times, if I may say so, praying together.

An American journalist in Palestine last year spent about three weeks visiting Arab villages and Jewish colonies and in one of the articles that he wrote in the New York Sun upon his return, he said that the only place he had found in the whole of Palestine where the Jews and Arabs were meeting in a friendly spirit was in the Young Men's Christian Association.

I would not for a moment press that too far. I would not claim that we are solving the problem in Palestine. We aren't. It is simply a drop in the bucket.

I told a story last night over in one of the Branches and one of the businessmen suggested that I tell you the same story, and I think perhaps I will. It illustrates what I am trying to say, perhaps as well as anything I can say would do.

We have that famous old British Regiment in Jerusalem, the Black Watch. Some of you are familiar with the Black Watch Regiment. I was over in Ticonderoga and saw a monument erected to the officers and the men of the Black Watch, some of whom fell during the Revolutionary War. I think I have never met a finer group of officers than those of the Black Watch Regiment. Last autumn the finals of the British army football tournament were being played on our field. The game between the Black Watch and the Air Force. The Black Watch won and the Colonel of the Regiment, as we were having tea afterward, was obviously and rightly proud of his team. I said, "Colonel, how would you like to play the Y.M.C.A.?" The Colonel agreed and the match was arranged. On the day of the game there were in the bleachers about 4,000 people, representing the various nationalities and groups, particularly the Jews and the Moslems and the Christian Arabs. Before the game the Black Watch band paraded up and down the field. It was quite a gala occasion. The High Commissioner was there to give away the prize.

When the Y.M.C.A. team came on the field, who were they? There were three Jews, two Moslem Arabs, three Christian Arabs, one Englishman, one Australian and one Yankee, and I might say to you that the two outstanding men on the field that afternoon were, first, a German Jew, a splendid, upstanding fellow who lived in our hostel, and the other, an Arab Moslem. Those two men, playing soccer, gave a demonstration of perfect team work as they passed the ball back and forth, from head to head and from foot to foot. We scored three goals and the Black Watch didn't score any.

But the significant thing was this, that even during that time of tension and stress it was possible for us to give a demonstration of some co-operation and friendship. I believe that is the only solution and I believe it is possible, if our leaders, and I believe, Gentlemen, particularly our Jewish leaders in this part of the world would take the initiative in insisting, first of all that, as Dr. Magnus says, we must come to an understanding, thus laying a basis for peace and goodwill.

I often think of the words of the poet, of whom the Empire can well be proud, and whose works I so much liked to read when in India—Rudyard Kipling. He was born in India and he lived in Lahore where I lived for a good many years. I used to sit at one of his desks. Although I never discovered that I was able to write poetry, I did learn to appreciate his writings, and I often recall his lines:

East is east, and west is west,
And never the twain shall meet.

I don't think anybody in Canada takes that attitude, but I know there are some nations that say it is better to build a wall around themselves and live unto themselves! "East is east, and west is west." England is England, Germany is Germany, China is China, and they will never meet. But Kipling didn't say that. He knew the East too well, he knew the West too well, and he knew the human heart too well.

"O east is east,
And west is west,
And never the twain shall meet,
Till earth and sky stand presently,
At God's great judgment seat,
But there is neither east nor west,
Border, nor breed, nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face,
Though they come from the ends of the earth."

Gentlemen of The Empire Club, I believe the challenge comes to this Club, I believe the challenge comes to the Y.M.C.A., I believe the challenge comes to bring men of the east and men of the west, men of different backgrounds and cultures together on some platform where they can understand each other and understand each other's point of view, and overlooking some of each other's idiosyncrasies in some way add their little weight in building around the world a bond of friendship which will make these hatreds, lack of confidences and mistrusts impossible.

High in the tower of our building at the very top are these words: Pray for the Peace of Jerusalem. Gentlemen, I make no apology whatever today in asking you, regardless of what faith you may have, to follow that wise injunction. I believe that Jerusalem and Palestine, particularly in these days of stress and strain, need our prayers that peace may be established there. Wouldn't it be fine if we could make Palestine, sacred alike to the Christians, the Jews and the Moslems, the three great monotheistic religions of the world, one place where the spirit of our Lord was actually being put into practice and where men were living in peace and goodwill?

I appreciate very much the opportunity of meeting with you today. I hope I have been fair in my treatment of the issues involved and that I have been able to give some little insight into the problems that men of goodwill out there, in England and in other countries, as well, are facing, as they attempt to find a solution for this problem that I believe is as perplexing and difficult as any problem that any group of statesmen are facing today. I thank you.

(Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Miller, we indeed are fortunate in having been able to prevail upon you to give us this very, very keen inside story of conditions as they are, and may I say, notwithstanding your modesty, that any man who can field a football team with so many races and defeat the team of a regiment—a Scottish Regiment—is bound to play an important part in the solution of the troubles in Jerusalem.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

"BRITAIN FACES GERMANY"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. WILLSON WOODSIDE

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, December 1, 1938.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: Britain faces Germany. Those ominous words are the title of the subject to be discussed today by our guest, Mr. Willson Woodside, Canadian traveller and journalist who has made a special study of European conditions in general, by means of a series of annual visits abroad in recent years.

Mr. Woodside is no stranger to either Canadian or United States readers, for he is a frequent contributor to standard periodicals in both countries. In fact, he was asked by Harpers Magazine to write their article on the Munich Conference. In his talk today he will discuss, among other things, possible developments within Germany and German foreign policy, and how long it may be before Britain and Germany are linked in another great crisis. I have much pleasure in presenting to you Mr. Willson Woodside. His subject is "Britain Faces Germany." (Applause)

MR. WILLSON WOODSIDE: Mr. Chairman and Members of The Empire Club: It is particularly gratifying to be back with you today, because my last appearance here four years ago was, I think, my first public speech and I am sure I never expected to be invited back. I had just returned from Germany at that time. I had seen the digging of underground air hangars, all done in secret at that time, the training of huge para-military forces, the building of new aircraft factories, the opening of new flying fields, and in a rather incoherent fashion, I tried to warn this corner of the world about the new German might.

All that we feared then has now happened, and again Britain stands face to face with the aggressive might of Germany, as she has so often done during the last forty or fifty years. Long before the last war there was intense colonial, commercial and naval rivalry between the two countries, and during the Boer War there was exhibited for the first time the extreme envy and hatred of Britain which was growing up in Germany. During the Great War, Britain was portrayed by German propaganda as the chief enemy of Germany: *England ist der Hauptfeind!* And German housewives went around solemly greeting each other: *Gott Strafe England!* "God punish England!"

So in the recent crisis nothing was so clear as that the question of peace or war in Europe was a question between Germany and Britain. Throughout the crisis Britain and Germany were the chief actors. France tagged along with Britain and Russia stayed back in the obscurity of the wings. Italy was scared to death.

* * * *

During the last half century there have been two policies in Britain for dealing with Germany. One was to join a bloc and restrain her through overwhelming opposition; the other, to try and find some working arrangement with her.

To show how little there is new under the sun, this latter policy of trying to find an arrangement with Germany was tried out just forty years ago this year, by the father of the present Prime Minister, "Joe" Chamberlain. Between 1898 and 1901 "Joe" Chamberlain worked very hard for an arrangement, even an alliance with Germany. At that time, as now, the price was to be colonial concessions.

The next approach to Germany was in 1912, when Lord Haldane went to Berlin to try and negotiate a naval "holiday" between Britain and Germany. But the Germans thought the advance only a proof that Britain was weakening, that she couldn't keep up the pace, that they had her on the run; so they refused the naval "holiday."

Twenty years have passed since then; the rivalry at sea has changed to rivalry in the air, and again we see a British Prime Minister trying to make some arrangement with Germany. Now, just exactly what is the policy of appeasement with Germany which Mr. Neville Chamberlain has been pursuing? The best statement I have seen of it, the clearest, has been by Lord Lothian. Speaking before the Royal Institute of International Affairs last March, after the Austrian crisis, Lord Lothian gave in clear words his view of what British policy toward Germany should be. He said that Germany's aggressiveness and unrest sprang from a sense of resentment against the injustice of the Versailles Treaty. She was filled with an urge for racial unity, justice, secure frontiers and assured markets in Eastern Europe. Britain should help her, he went on, to achieve racial unity within strong frontiers, and allow her a sphere of economic influence of her own. Then the Nazi ferment would die down, German aggressiveness would pass, Hitler's cause would be taken away from him, and we could live in peace with Germany.

We should be ready, Lord Lothian said, to negotiate these things. And we are willing to negotiate about further German minorities in Europe (the Sudetens), about trade pacts and even colonies, but we shall not accede to any more violent grabs.

This speech, I believe, provided almost a blue-print for what happened. It indicates, I think, very clearly, that the Munich Agreement—and this point has been too much missed—was really an *agreement* between Hitler and Chamberlain, that for various reasons each wanted to see Sudetenland transferred from Czecho-Slovakia to Germany. I am not imputing any treachery to Chamberlain. I am not saying that he is pro-Nazi, or anti-Czech. I think there is a lot of silly talk about this "betraying" of Czecho-Slovakia, but I do think he was actuated by strictly pro-British sentiment, and I do think that he, and the inner Cabinet, especially, were strongly motivated by fear of the Bolshevist "bogey." Beyond that, I believe that Chamberlain was motivated throughout by profoundly humanitarian motives.

This question, I think of the Munich Agreement as really carrying out a policy of Mr. Chamberlain's, is so important that I would like to advance a little evidence, if I may.

All through the crisis Mr. Chamberlain was the most active person, and his actions were certainly not those of a man without a policy. It was Mr. Chamberlain who first officially proposed the cession of Sudetenland, and Mr. Chamberlain who forced it first on France and then on the Czechs, to the consternation of the world. Even after Godesberg, when the world thought Britain was preparing to resist Hitler's demands, Mr. Chamberlain kept repeating that he would back with all Britain's moral force the promise the Czechs had made to cede Sudetenland. The only thing that Mr. Chamberlain was standing out against was the German threat of a violent solution.

As soon as the Munich Conference could be arranged Mr. Chamberlain stepped down from the head of a great European coalition which was rapidly forming against Germany almost against Mr. Chamberlain's will, and hurried to give Hitler at Munich all he had asked for, *by negotiation.* When Munich was finished he returned home showing every evidence of a belief that he had triumphed, that his policy had won, and that he had done something really big to please Germany and secure "peace for our time." He had carried through a sort of revision of the Versailles Treaty without a shot having been fired. He had insisted all along that there was nothing more at stake than the issue of self-determination for the Sudetens, the satisfying of a more or less just German demand, and he had settled this thorny question without war.

It is noteworthy that Mr. Chamberlain made no effort to organize a bloc of nations to oppose the German demands and that as Mr. Duff Cooper has revealed, he refused to mobilize the fleet when that might have been a salutary warning to Germany. Just how salutary it might have been we can gather from the German reaction when the fleet actually was mobilized, on the very last day before Munich. Goebbels had listened to Mr. Chamberlain's notable speech of the Tuesday, and decided that it was not the speech of a war-maker. He gave out the order to all German papers to announce Germany's general mobilization for two o'clock on the next afternoon. About midnight the news that the British fleet had been mobilized reached Berlin. Goebbels immediately countermanded his instructions and spared no effort to see that the news did not get out in the morning papers.

* * * *

The British Government must have had ample information to prove that Germany did not have the iron or oil or food to fight a big war. There was no chance of Germany fighting a war against a number of major powers, and there was a very strong element in the army and in economic life that would have opposed to the bitter end such a struggle, which Germany could only lose. For if there is one thing that the German military leaders learned from the last war it is *not to lose the next.*

They knew, the whole world knew, that Mussolini was beside himself as to what course to take. He had a country split from top to bottom on the question of fighting on Germany's side, war-weary, and lacking in supplies and war materials for a big campaign.

But of all Mr. Chamberlain's motives for this policy, I think the chief one was a belief that another war in the West was utterly senseless and futile. I think he questioned himself what could be done differently after it was over next time, or must we go on fighting Germany every twenty years? He knew that another war would help nobody and ruin them all, that democracy and civilization as we know it—and this he said several times over—would be ruined. I think he decided that if war was to be avoided there had to be a swift treatment of its causes. His diagnosis of those causes—with which all of us certainly will not agree — we have already treated.

Then I believe that the present British Government had decided several years before that it was wise to attempt only to hold the West of Europe, that the best that Britain could hope to do was to keep war away from there, which was, after all, the treasure house of civilization. A war in the West would destroy the museums, the art treasures, the great cities; it would irreparably smash the fabric of our present civilization. If there *must* be war in Europe, the argument ran, then it is better to have it in the East than in the West. It is better that the bombs drop on peasants' fields than on the museums and the great cities and populations of Western Europe. If Germany *has* to be stopped, let the Slavs stop her; and I think at the back of all this there is a hope, perhaps more than a faint hope, that Germany might work off her Nazi aggressiveness on Russia's Bolshevism.

Having made up his mind that the West should be held, and that all Britain could do was to hold the West, Mr. Chamberlain had to seek to break the entanglements which drew France into the quarrels of Eastern Europe, the link between France and Russia which Czecho-Slovakia formed, and the chance that the strong Czech frontier always held for starting a war in which the French would follow automatically, and into which Britain would again be drawn, into which we would all be drawn, as someone said, like a chain of box cars.

Now, it is my opinion that a solid front formed when Eden asked for it last spring, or even last summer, any time before Nuremberg, would have stopped Germany. I believe that was the right policy to pursue. But one must face the fact that standing up to Germany always implied the risk of a war. Of course, I think it always will imply the risk of war and the only way we can ever stop the aggression of the Fascist powers is to be willing to fight, if necessary. When you get to that point you have to realize that, militarily speaking, Czecho-Slovakia was a lost position, certainly after the German invasio of Austria. Hitler had played such a clever game i assuring Britain and France and concentrating his who might against Czecho-Slovakia, and in winning the sympathy of Poland, Hungary and Italy that he placed Britain and France in the impossible position of having to take the offensive if they were to aid Czecho-Slovakia. After thinking for twenty years only of the defensive this was for them, I think, a psychological impossibility.

* * * *

Now, what has been the effect of this policy of appeasing Germany? Well, far from satisfying her, it has only served to prove to the Germans that it is strength that counts. Goebbels has said, "We have learned that the only instrument with which to conduct foreign policy is the sword." The Agreement of Munich has been presented to the German people as "The German Peace of Munich," wrung from the democracies by German threats. Goebbels said, "By threatening war we avoided war."

If you study the German publications you can learn everything that is in the German mind. It is one of the great German weaknesses that they are unable to keep anything to themselves.

We have seen how German arrogance and ambitions have soared. At Saarbrucken Hitler practically told Britain who she should have for Prime Minister. Far from learning to respect and admire Chamberlain and be grateful to him for all his pains in arranging things so nicely, as I think Mr. Chamberlain hoped he would, Hitler has gone about making insulting speeches about "umbrella statesmanship." He has arrogantly offered the British a one-third air ratio. Thinking themselves already the masters of Europe, the Germans have taken for granted that they would soon have the colonies back, and I have even seen it hinted in Dr. Schacht's paper that after the return of the colonies they would consider having *the reparations* back.

Throughout Eastern Europe the Germans have acted, s they well may, as masters. They have forced Benes ut. They have forced an authoritarian regime on echo-Slovakia. They have forced a highway corridor ross the latter country. They have demanded further purely Czech territory and they are obtaining it. They have had the Communist Party dissolved and are forcing anti-Semitism on Czecho-Slovakia. They have gained control over the coal supplies of Czecho-Slovakia, and have strengthened their hold on the Czechs in various other ways. Their argument is a brutally simple one, something like this: It is liable to be very cold this winter—wouldn't it be nice to have some coal? You realize that this is a very strong argument. The Germans have a thousand ways of pinching the now helpless Czechs like that, if they don't understand plain talk.

We have also seen the Germans shake their fist at Helsingfors and demand the retirement of the Finnish Foreign Minister. The Finnish Foreign Minister has retired. The Germans can demand the expulsion of any editor, any Foreign Minister, any Prime Minister, and even any King in Eastern Europe. The Germans are masters of Eastern Europe and they know it.

They have been encouraged to go ahead with their grandiose scheme of having the "oppressed" people of the Ukraine cry for "liberation." You notice how they have insistently held on to that little bit of the tail end of Czecho-Slovakia — Carpathian Ruthenia, adjoining Roumania. In an interesting speech recently, the Premier of this province announced that the name would be changed to the Carpatho-Ukraine.

Now, this movement on the part of Germany has a very strong appeal to the Ukrainians in Soviet Russia. They are not happy. Many a Ukrainian in Russia told me a couple of years ago that the best rulers they ever had were the Germans in 1918. They have not particularly enjoyed Soviet rule. The Ukraine is the richest part of Russia and it suffered most in the Revolution, in the Kulaks expropriation, and in the famine of 1933, when the Soviets came in and simply took the peasants' wheat. At least two and a half to three million Ukrainians died from this forced starvation in 1933.

I think Hitler has a very strong cause there. In a world dominated by fear, confusion is a powerful weapon, and one man spreading hate and confusion can outdo a thousand talking tolerance, good will and brotherly love. I think Hitler might succeed with his

Ukrainian programme, and not necessarily through a military campaign, but simply by worming away and spreading confusion and disunity.

No more than the Munich Agreement appeased German demands did it appeal to their finer nature, as Lord Lothian hoped. We have seen the recent brutal outbreak of persecution of the Jews. We have read excerpts from the *Schwarze Korps,* as published in the Globe and Mail a few days ago. This is reality, Gentlemen. The *Schwarze Korps* is the organ of the Black Guard—which should be pronounced quickly — "blackguard!" The *Schwarze Korps* said during the Jewish persecution:

"Before Munich we had to pay some heed to world opinion. Since Munich the swords of the democracies are as though made of pasteboard. We need heed now neither their leaders nor their masses, their Jews or non-Jews, their Christians or atheists. We will dictate peace in Europe on our terms."

There are Britons who could have foretold this reaction, who did foretell it.

In what is perhaps the most complete modern statement of what British policy ought to be, made in 1907, Sir Eyre Crowe said that the worst possible policy to pursue with Germany was one of concessions. These only increased her appetite and her arrogance. You will find a similar view laid out in a remarkable little book, "Germany and England," by Professor J. A. Cramb, published early in 1914. You will also find it in a fine little book, "The German Tragedy and its Meaning for Canada," by Sir Robert Falconer, that might have been written last week but that actually bears the date of 1915.

One of the best and most succinct explanations of why this policy won't work with Germans was given not long ago by Harold Nicolson, well-known British diplomat and writer. Nicolson explains the fundamental difference in the British and the German view of diplomatic negotiations. The Briton looks upon them as little more than a business deal. He wants the parties to sit down on either side of a table and come to some satisfactory compromise, each yielding a little, and then agree that this being the best possible solution, they will keep to it. The German regards this as little better than horse-swapping. To him it is a demeaning process. To him diplomacy is something much more glorious, a form of warfare, and he brings to it the technique of warfare, attacks and camouflage and flanking manoeuvres, and strategic retreats if necessary to more solid positions. What he is pursuing is really some abstract goal, Triumph—Power. He looks upon every concession demanded of him as an insult and on every concession which you show yourself willing to make as a proof of your weakness. He considers the concessions he gains not so much valuable in themselves as a proof of his triumph, and this is what has always made it so difficult for the British and Germans to come to a solid working agreement.

Consider this when you reflect on Chamberlain giving away the fortress of Central Europe at Munich and accepting a little piece of paper which he waved in triumph before the crowd at the London airport, a piece of paper which said, "I will promise not to fight you," signed "Adolf Hitler."

Now, what are Hitler's promises worth? He promised Mussolini solemnly in 1934, in June, that he had no designs on Austria. The next month he attempted a coup in Austria and Mussolini furiously marched his divisions to the frontier. Four different times Hitler promised to the world that he would respect the independence of Austria, that he had no desire to infringe on it. That didn't affect the final result. In a big speech in 1935 Hitler promised solemnly that, although he was determined to smash Versailles, which was forced on Germany, he would respect Locarno, which Germany entered into of her own free will. (As a matter of fact the negotiations were started by Stresemann.) Ten months later when Hitler smashed Locarno and marched his troops into the Rhineland, he said, "Germany is entitled to smash treaties any time she feels herself strong enough to do so."

This is the man who said, after Munich, "Now, there is an end to all the foolish talk about the rights of little nations." This is the man who wrote in "Mein Kampf" that "since everybody tells little lies, if you are going to tell a lie, don't tell a little one; tell such a big one that nobody will ever dream it can be a lie."

We should also keep in front of us when we listen to Hitler's promises, this saying which he has uttered over and over again, "What is right is what is good for Germany."

Nor do I think it would be much different if Hitler should suddenly die and we had to deal with a different leader in Germany. Of course, there would be changes. What I mean is we would still have an aggressive Germany. After the great Bismarck passed we had the Kaiser to deal with. After the Kaiser we had Hitler. I think he expresses something deep in Germany, some deep, historical urge, an urge which has persisted since the days of Frederick the Great, a belief in Germany's unique mission to rule the world and confer on it her superior Kultur. Many Germans are so convinced of this superiority of Germanism that they don't take seriously promises which they make for purposes of policy to "inferior people."

So, I am brought to ask whether this whole premise underlying Munich, that Germany was suffering from the sting of Versailles still, and really only wanted to achieve her racial frontiers and secure markets in Eastern Europe, isn't entirely illusory, whether there isn't some stronger historical urge that must be kept in mind all the time.

* * * *

What on her part has been the effect of the Munich Agreement on Britain? Has it brought her peace? If so, why is she preparing for war as never before? If Britain has to arm, and I quote here a catechism which I saw yesterday by Vernon Bartlett, against whom is she arming? If she is arming against Germany, why did she give away the fortress in Central Europe and the Czech army? If, on the other hand, it was her unpreparedness that brought about Munich, if this really was a capitulation before Germany and not an agreement, why aren't the men responsible for her unpreparedness court-martialled and put out of office?

Now, how far away is the next crisis? That depends on the governments in a number of places, not least of them, in France. We have seen France stand together in the crisis and fall apart as soon as the danger was removed, and this will always be the case. Time is not on France's side. France always appears weak in peace time and always stands together when there is danger, but this appearance of weakness is a great danger. We see in the papers today that Mussolini has been so far encouraged by it to demand Tunisia, Corsica and Djibouti. If France gets weaker, if she sees Italy thundering in the Mediterranean, and a Fascist state arises on her southern borders, and the present rearmament blundering goes on in Britain, won't Germany be encouraged to demand Alsace-Lorraine next year? Sooner than later, I would say. Don't forget, Germany hasn't that great supply of iron that a warlike state needs, above all. She hasn't secured that yet. There are only three big supplies on the Continent—in French Lorraine, in the Soviet Ukraine and in Swedish Lapland. Germany's logical source is Lorraine. She is bound to ask for it some time. She could apply the same technique—hold a pistol at Paris and London, and make the same threat of a barbaric attack. We mustn't rule out altogether the fact that Germany's young men are being assiduously brought up as barbarians, their humanitarian scruples repressed. Hitler has been quoted as saying, "I won't have my young men going to church; they might learn scruples." These young men are being brought up to believe in everything that we don't believe in. It is quite conceivable for Germany to launch just such a terriffic assault on London and English industrial centres, as she practised on Barcelona last March. The Nazi leaders, drunk with the success of their forceful methods, and believing Britain to be weakening, might be tempted to drive through one great body punch in the hope of snatching the Empire away from her. This has to be considered as a possibility today. We only have to look at Spain and China, and the threats held out at Munich to realize the situation.

What will happen, and the nearness of the next crisis will also depend, however—fortunately—on developments in Germany. We have recently seen a wave of violence break out there. This wave of violence may be checked by some blood purge, or it may sweep on as other revolutions have done; carrying its leaders along with it, and perhaps go on from violence against the Jews, to violence against the Christian churches, especially against the Catholic churches, which have large properties in Germany and Austria, and from that to a revolution against property itself. But I don't believe there will be such a revolutionary move in Germany. I remember, after four years of suffering in the war, the terrible revolutionaries of 1918 went around the signs, "Please Keep Off The Grass" in Berlin. There is something too orderly in the German nature, apparently, to permit of a violent revolution.

There is a possibility, I think a certainty, that Germany will run into plenty of trouble in Eastern Europe. There will soon be a hornets' nest stirred up there. Germany will move too fast and prove too arrogant with these so-called "inferior" people and will, as before, turn all against her.

I think if you consider, as I do, that the next war, which will be merely the second phase of the struggle begun in 1914, is on now, then Germany has suffered in the last couple of weeks in the great outbreak of world opinion against her over the Jewish pogrom, such a defeat as she suffered in the Great War through the burning of Louvain, or the sinking of the Lusitania. The New York Times asked the other day, "Who could believe that the Germans would so soon turn a great victory into a great defeat?" I believe the masters of Germany will end by turning the whole world against them. I think that here is perhaps our best chance of salvation, for our own defence preparations are going ahead far too slowly. I think probably we agree that the maintenance of peace depends more on Britain than on any other country. Britain's survival, it seems to me, depends first on a great effort at home, a unity of her people and a willingness to make sacrifices such as have not yet been made; secondly on very close, trustful co-operation with France and thirdly on a close co-operation with the United States.

Now, personally, I don't see any prospect of this being achieved under present British leadership. It seems to me that very shortly, if not already, Mr. Chamberlain's policy will have been proved false, if not disastrous. I do not think the men of the present Inner Cabinet—there is Hoare, who certainly lost face in the democratic world with the Hoare-Laval deal, and Simon, who has no backing at all in the United States—can unite the British nation and carry out the necessary preparations, work closely with the masses of France, and win the trust and co-operation of the Dominions and the United States.

So I ask myself, does an alternative to the present Government exist in Britain? A Cabinet of young Conservatives, I think, would do. It seems to me that Britain needs younger leadership, that only in Britain is the older generation, the pre-war generation, still in control. Younger men wouldn't just look for "peace for our time," a comfortable seat by the fireside. That was not the spirit that built the British Empire. That isn't the spirit which has held it together. You have to take risks if you are going to be a world leader. Better than a Cabinet of only young Conservatives would be one of National Union. These are affairs of Britain's internal policy, I know, but I can't help feeling that a Cabinet of such men as Churchill and Eden, the young Conservative ministers, and young Liberals and Labour members would be immensely stronger than the present array, and more inspiring to the Dominions and democracies in general.

It seems to me more than that is needed; that a really realistic policy needs to be developed in Britain, a policy of ideals, a policy of advancing the ideas of freedom, the rights of little nations, tolerance and international law—the things which we have come to think Britain stands for. It is the only policy, Gentlemen, which will unite the British people, hold the Dominions behind Britain and win the co-operation of the United States.

Some say Britain is "old." Just as a man is first young, then matures and finally grows old, so they say that the British nation has become "old." I don't know about that. I am going back soon to try and see for myself. I know it was said before the last war; they have been saying it for a long time. Personally, I think there is something very tough in the Britisher, something very resilient. But I also know that war today comes quicker than it ever did before and that Britain can't just blunder through next time. She will have to prepare and prepare swiftly.

Thank you, Gentlemen. (Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Woodside, on behalf of the members of the Empire Club, I thank you very sincerely for the splendid address which you have given us. I do not know how the members feel about this, but I can not help feeling in the back of my head, that when the next war comes, if come it must, Great Britain will win the last battle. (Applause)

The meeting is adjourned

"PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE MITCHELL F. HEPBURN

Chairman: The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, December 15, 1938

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Prime Minister, Honourable Ministers and Gentlemen of The Empire Club: I am sure that each one of us has at one time or another heard a Chairman proudly and loudly declare that the guest-speaker needs no introduction, and then proceed to occupy five or seven minutes of the speaker's time by telling who he is, what he is, and why. Today, it will be amply sufficient for this Chairman to say that on behalf of the Empire Club we welcome for the first time as our guest-speaker, the Honourable Mitchell F. Hepburn, Premier of the Province of Ontario. The Honourable Mr. Hepburn has chosen as his subject, "Present Day Problems." I have much pleasure in introducing the Honourable Mr. Hepburn.

(Applause)

HONOURABLE MITCHELL F. HEPBURN: Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: I want to avail myself of the first opportunity possible to thank you for the wonderful reception you have accorded me on this, the occasion of my first visit to your Club, apart from the time I was here listening to my old friend, Jim Curran, discuss whether Columbus or someone else discovered this country. Well, it was all very interesting. But I am not so much concerned as to who discovered the country. The thing I am troubled about now is who in the world is going to save the country.

Naturally, I will have to follow, to some extent at least the subject which has been assigned to me, that called, "Present Day Problems." I don't know whether you want me to discuss my own problems or yours. In either event, I am sure discussion on either would take most of the afternoon.

The last place in the world my detractors would suspect me of being at this moment is at the Empire Club, because just recently I have been accused of being in a conspiracy to rip this country asunder.

It reminds me, finding myself here at the moment, of the story of the lady's cow which was lost and everyone in the little village had tried as best they could to find her. Finally, they enlisted the help of the village nitwit. He said, "I will have the cow back in half an hour. You watch." They did and sure enough, he was back right on the dot with the widow's cow. This aroused the curiosity of a lot of people and they said, "Where did you find her?" He said, "I stood on the street corner and I said to myself, 'Where would a cow go to get lost?' I went there and there is where I found her."

Apropros of my remark as to whether this country is worth saving, it reminds me of a true incident that happened in the rural section of the country where I was born and raised, having to do with an Irish family. Of course we find a lot of Irish on the farm and a lot of pigs. The pigs had a wallow and the young Irish lad fell in the mud puddle. His father picked him out and handed him to his mother. His mother looked at the boy for a moment, held him up and said, "Pat, for Heaven's sake is he worth saving?"

I think this country is worth saving. We are going to save this country, notwithstanding the remarks of my detractors, and others who talk about Canada being broke and so on, and so forth. I believe in one Canada, not nine Canadas. (Applause) I so stated the position of the Province of Ontario at the time I appeared before the Rowell Commission. Now, many criticisms have been levelled against me as your Provincial Treasurer and Prime Minister, because of the attitude I took on that occasion. Now, Gentlemen, I want to take you into my confidence today and speak very frankly, and I am going to speak in simple, understandable language. We are passing through a transition period which is taxing the capacities of those charged with the responsibility of shaping public policy.

I read with great interest, prior to the sittings of the Rowell Commission in this Capital City of Ontario, the presentations which had been made by representatives of the various other provinces of the Dominion, and it appeared to me that those other provinces were appearing before the Commission with hats in hand, so to speak. They were demanding certain concessions from the central government and we must bear in mind, those of us who are citizens of Ontario, that we contribute about one-half of the national revenue. So, when these other provinces demanded something like 76 million dollars per year, as compensation from the central government for alleged grievances which they thought they were suffering from, it was my obligation and my duty, as your Prime Minister and as your Treasurer, to state Ontario's case fairly and fearlessly. That, I tried to do. I am not going to quote the words which I used at that time, except to say just this that I believe Ontario has paid its share with regard to Confederation, and I do not believe that Ontario should be asked to contribute any more.

I wonder if you gentlemen, who are leaders of thought in your own community realize the inroads which are being made today upon the resources of this, the central Province, and the richest province? I wonder if you realize that at this moment you are paying subventions for coal from Alberta, approximately one-half the freight rates on feeder cattle coming from the West to Ontario, and you are paying subventions for wheat going to both seaboards? With respect to the Maritimes you are paying subsidies to the extent of $2.00 per ton on Maritime coal coming to Ontario, you are paying subsidies on fish, you are paying subsidies on potatoes.

We have in Ontario a great industrial concern, located in Sault Ste. Marie, that is struggling along in competition with another great concern of a like nature, located in the Maritime Provinces, which concern derives approximately a million and a half dollars per year in the way of subsidies and our industry in Sault Ste. Marie has to compete, although, and this is the irony of it, it pays its share of taxation to subsidize a competitive industry in the Maritimes.

Now, we have our railway problem which has been aggravated in no small measure by overexpansion. We agree that we suffer because of our very geography. But the great contributions we are making now toward railway deficits have to do with overexpansion in the West. We put up a million dollars a week, or at least we add that to our debt, as the result of trying to maintain railway service for those in the sparsely settled sections of the West. That is a tremendous thing. It is more than the entire budget of the Federal Government at the beginning of this century.

Then we built the Hudson Bay Railway, at great expense. Seated next to me is my good friend, Jack Bickell, my co-Arctic explorer. That week that Jack and I were reported missing a lot of good Tories thought, "My Heavens, can it be true?" But like death and taxes. we turned up again, much to the discomfort of a lot of my detractors—not confined to my own political camp, strangely enough. And I see here from the other camp, my good friend, Earl Rowe, and my equally good friend, Howard Ferguson, who seems to have regained the elixir of life. When I get to his age I am going to figure out just how it can be done, too.

Gentlemen, I recall in going to Ottawa, many years ago as a young, inexperienced farmer member from the County of Elgin, I discussed with one of the Cabinet Ministers at that time the advisability of going on with the Hudson Bay Railway, and I said to him, "Can you conceive of any wheat trader storing wheat in a port to be frozen over for ten months of the year?" He said, "No, that just isn't in the cards. It won't be done, but we have to go on with the railway. The West is demanding it. It is a political railway and we have to carry it on to completion." Which we did. We have spent, I presume, fifty-some millions of dollars. (I have to be very careful about figures now, after being checked up so closely by the Globe the other day.) We spent approximately fifty million dollars and we have been paying interest on the money since the road was completed, and this year only two small vessels sailed into the Port of Churchill to take wheat out. That is a load that we of Ontario are carrying because of the West's demands.

Now, this year the West had sufficient political influence to force the Federal Government again to guarantee a price for wheat. Now, Gentlemen, the prosperity of Canada has to do with our ability to sell wheat. The whole basic foundation of Canada was predicated on selling wheat. Now, strangely enough, the consumption of wheat is falling off all over the world and we are feeling the effect of it. We are only on the fringe of what we are going to have to settle in the course of time, but even on this very continent, the great wheat producing continent of North America, the consumption of wheat in the last few decades has fallen off by one-third. Now, in the other countries of the world they are trying to apply policies of self-sufficiency, so they are not buying the same amount of wheat from us. We aggravated this situation ourselves, some years ago, when we formed the Wheat Pool, ostensibly for the purpose of orderly marketing, but it didn't work out that way. Greed asserted itself, with the result the Western Wheat Pool, instead of marketing wheat as the world's demands warranted, held wheat back from the market, with the hope of getting higher prices, and we stimulated production in competitive countries as a consequence. When we finally arrived at the conclusion we had to sell our wheat, we crashed the wheat markets to the lowest levels known in this century.

Now, following that, instead of taking stock and inventory, we foolishly bolstered up again the production of wheat by guarantees, and this year, as the result of the guaranteed price this country will lose approximately 60 or 70 millions of dollars. It is hard to estimate at this moment just what the loss will be. Yesterday, in Manitoba, there was a Wheat Conference, and it was frankly admitted by those in attendance, that there is a carry-over of over one billion bushels.

Now, does it seem logical or reasonable to you men who are students of public affairs, that we should bonus production of wheat at a time when our markets are falling off? Should we stimulate and increase the production of wheat when there isn't a corresponding demand?

I was talking not so long ago to a gentleman from Alberta, who told of the great irrigation scheme at Brooks, sponsored and financed largely with public funds, where they tried to get the farmers into diversified production, but as a result of the wheat guarantee all the alfalfa fields are being ploughed up, in order that they can grow more wheat next year.

I say, Gentlemen, when you see things like that you sort of wonder where we are heading. Politics! Politics, pure and simple. There is no other answer to it. It was a bid to get the votes of the West, but it is going to create a worse condition in time, than the one that obtains at this moment.

Now, the West demands 67 million dollars, as I said, as compensation. I had to appear before the Rowell Commission, not as one prepared to tear down our Confederation, but as one prepared to put Ontario's case fairly and squarely before that august assemblage. That I tried to do, and because I placed Ontario's case before the Commission I was charged with being in line or in league with those who would tear down our Confederation. I want to say, my friends, there is no Premier of any province, nor any Prime Minister of this country, who could unscramble this Confederation of ours. We are linked together, but we are not going to get very far if we appear as other provinces have done, hat in hand, as I said, demanding more and more from the central government. But that sort of thing is more or less in line with the mentality of the people of today.

Now, there has been a great deal said about national unity. I am just going to make this one observation with regard to my friend, William Lyon Mackenzie King, and I want it made very clear here that when I drank the Toast to the King, a few moments ago, it was to Our

Majesty, the King. They said all around me, "The King." I wanted to make myself clear on that point. This gentleman at this moment is charging me with entering into a conspiracy to destroy Confederation. Now, I deny the allegation most emphatically. There isn't a more loyal Canadian in this great gathering than myself. Why shouldn't I be? I was born and raised here. Like the rest of you I love this Canada of ours and I am proud to know that this Canada of ours is a link in the great British Empire. I am not only a Canadian, I am an Imperialist, if you want to call me that. Naturally you expect that, since I am of Scottish descent—Scottish and Irish. As a matter of fact, there is quite a controversy between the two peoples in my County. The Scottish people insist that I am Irish, and the Irish insist that I am Scottish. I just want to make this observation about the gentleman at Ottawa, and this will be pleasing to the ears of my good friend, Earl Rowe, I am sure. He, who today is charging me with entering into conspiracy to destroy our Confederation is the same gentleman who, in 1930, and I was there in the Dominion Parliament at the time, sitting as one of his supporters, got up and enunciated a policy which I think did more, in the way of endeavour, at least, to destroy Confederation than anything else, when he said—and I know my friend, Earl Rowe recalls the occasion, I could see the plunder in his eye after Mackenzie King made the speech, because he could see a great victory for his own forces as a consequence of that endeavour to destroy this Confederation of ours—Mackenzie King said, "Not a five cent piece for relief for any province with a Tory Government!" Just imagine, my friends, that man talking today about anyone else breaking up Confederation, and talking about leading a party, based on the policy of national unity. (Applause) My Gosh, I am glad there are some Tories in the audience. (Laughter)

I just want you to analyze that statement. Here was the national leader enunciating a policy with a club. In other words, he said, "If the Provinces do not elect the kind of government satisfactory to me, then those provinces will not get a five cent piece for relief." Well, I don't know, I thought that the government that I led was satisfactory to him for a while, at least, but he is getting so near that five cent piece, so far as relief is concerned, that I am questioning my own political affiliations at this moment.

Now, Gentlemen, I referred just briefly to the presentation of Ontario's case before the Rowell Commission. We have to defend our position. I believe Ontario has paid its fair share in the way of a contribution toward Confederation. This is the richest of all the provinces. We are not getting the full benefit of the revenues from our natural resources. Those revenues are going to the Federal Treasury. We are not complaining in particular about that. We pioneered in our North Country. We built roads, extended hydro lines. We even own a railway up there which was built, primarily, for the purpose of developing and opening up the great mining areas and we stand by, not complaining over the fact that three-quarters of the revenue derived in Northern Ontario goes to the Federal Treasury, and from there is dispersed for the purposes I have outlined to you. We are not complaining in particular about that. But not so very long ago, my friends, we found it necessary to import some aeroplanes for fire prevention purposes, only, not for commercial use, and the Dominion Government demanded from the Province of Ontario duty on those planes. We didn't complain about that then, but I take exception to this charge, continually levelled against Ontario, to the effect we are an exploiting province. If it were not for the riches of Ontario, I don't know what would happen to the rest of the Dominion.

What we want today is a better understanding as between the different provinces, and a better understanding, will not be brought about by Federal Ministers going around and levelling charges that Quebec and Ontario are conspiring against the rest of the Dominion. We submit to all these drains upon us because we want to maintain our Confederation, and we are going to maintain our Confederation. It doesn't necessarily follow that we should be the goats of everybody, and I think I would be derelict in my duty if I did not as your Premier, put Ontario's case, as I did, fairly and squarely before the Rowell Commission.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I have washed my hands of the whole business, because the Dominion Government did something which I cannot forgive it for. There are many things it hasn't done, more than it has done, as a matter of fact. This Commission was set up for the purpose of studying facts and problems as between the Dominion and the Provinces, and before the Commission had a chance to report to the Federal Government, new taxation was levied by the Dominion which invaded a field of provincial taxation. Now, remember, my friends, Confederation was brought about as a result of an agreement between the Provinces. We created the central government, the central government did not create us. But before this Commission had a chance to report the Federal Government, in the last session, invoked new taxation which invaded present provincial fields of taxation, and I refer particularly to the gift tax, which is a direct invasion of the field of succession duties.

I look with wonder in my eye at the many, many millionaires I see around here. There is Jack Bickell, and Sam McLaughlin and all the rest of the fellows. I can't help but think when I see chaps like that around of how we are going to collect revenue for the province. I keep enquiring about their health. In fact, I think I will circularize a lot of the millionaires, day by day, to find how they are progressing, in the hope that some time or other I can excel last year's all time high record of collection of succession duties.

That right of succession duties was conferred upon the provinces, and the drive today, emanating from the other provinces is to get control of succession duties and place all collections under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. If that were to happen, I can tell you, Gentlemen, I would have to impose some new taxes upon you, because I inherited a debt. You know my friend, Howard Ferguson? Bless his heart, he is a great fellow! He is a very astute man. You know he was the luckiest Premier this Province ever had. He blamed the debts which he inherited on his predecessors, he added to them and then handed them on to me. I have to meet the obligations which were handed down to me, and after I sat in his chair in Queen's Park, pinched myself a couple of times and took stock and inventory, I thought of the old adage, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread," and some of you now who look upon me as the Tax Collector of the Province, probably use language in speaking of my methods of collection which I couldn't repeat before this august and important assembly. That is my responsibility, to meet the obligations of the Province of Ontario, to protect the interests of the Province of Ontario. That is what I am trying to do. That is why, as I say, I appeared before the Rowell Commission and tried to place Ontario's case before that body.

I say the Dominion Government, as a result of new taxation levied while the great problems were under consideration by an important Commission, has violated the spirit of the whole thing. So you can't blame me if I disassociate myself from any further sittings of that body, because they only made Ontario look foolish. We were sincere, we were genuine, we placed the fairest brief of all. We didn't ask for anything. We weren't there in a bargaining spirit. We just wanted to present the facts of the case. So I will leave that issue to one side for the time being.

Now, then, my friends, the question naturally arises, what are we going to do about this whole situation? The other day the Globe took me to task for some alleged statement of mine about cutting down interest carrying charges by 7 or 8 hundred million dollars a year. I, of course, at that time, was referring to all debt, public and private. Now, the public debt of Canada, which includes all municipal debt, all provincial debt, and the Federal debt, totals over 8 billions of dollars, and they are all increasing with great rapidity. In Ontario alone, we were able to show a corresponding asset for any increase in debt, and that is what it should be. If you as individuals were to increase your obligations without a corresponding asset, then you would be headed for bankruptcy, and that is the way this nation is heading at the present time because the Federal Government, in paying for those subventions, borrowing money to take care of 50 million dollars deficit on railways each year, losing 60 millions on wheat alone in this one calendar year, paying in some instances a hundred per cent of the relief cost of the West, and according to the Premier of Saskatchewan, who appeared before the Rowell Commission, three-quarters of the people of Saskatchewan last year were on relief, all of these charges are being built up, added to the debt structure without the corresponding asset. In the last seven or eight years the Dominion Government has gone in debt about a billion dollars, with no corresponding assets. We loaned some 140 million dollars to the West, not a dollar of which is recoverable. We know that. There is no use trying to fool ourselves. We know we can't collect that money.

Only the other day I had a visit from the Treasurer of one of the Western Provinces. He told me that debt charges in his province constituted one-half of the revenue, and he said, "We couldn't get along then unless we were able to borrow more and more from the Federal Government. The municipalities are paying a six per cent rate and they are all in bankruptcy."

We have saved our municipalities. Since this government took office not a single municipality has gone in default. We have done that at a great expense to the Province. We have taken over certain fixed charges formerly borne by the municipalities, to wit, the cost of old age pensions, the cost of mothers' allowances. We have paid the one mill subsidy. Only the other day we gave the City of Toronto $150,000 as its share of the one mill subsidy. We have taken over the entire cost of maintaining our indigent patients in our sanitoriums, our T.B. patients. All these things have been done by the Province in order to assist the municipalities which are struggling along at the present time, imposing an almost impossible tax rate on the owners of real estate. We are trying to ease that burden.

The thing seems impossible to me. I have never felt more discouraged about the situation than at the present time. Within the sphere of our own jurisdiction we are trying, as best we can, to meet our obligations, and to assist the overburdened taxpayers. It is like putting an ice pack on Mount Vesuvius. While here in Ontario we are trying to do those things, trying to give good government, trying to economize, doing things in the interests of the people, look at Ottawa and see the debt mounting, day by day, millions by millions, half of which is borne by Ontario, because we constitute, as I said, one half of all the Federal taxation.

The question arises, what are we going to do about it? Who is the Moses who is going to lead us out of the wilderness? The other night when I was talking to a gathering of people I said, "What would I do if I were King?" I didn't mean Mackenzie King, either. I would face the issues frankly and fairly. I am speaking at this moment before a group of financiers, leaders in the political and economic life of our country, and I say you are faced with an obvious fact, why not be frank about the whole situation? Now, we are in debt so far—8 billion dollars—we are paying so much interest, over 400 million dollars a year, we simply can't carry on without increased borrowing and that is what we are doing. We are borrowing money, more and more each year, to take care of fixed overhead. The question of reducing overhead is one that has been cussed and discussed. I have done a few little things in the way of reducing overhead. I closed Ontario House in London, England. It was a miniature duplication of the service being maintained by the Federal authorities. When my friend, Howard Ferguson, was in England, I say this without any thought of flattery, he did more to sell Canadian goods and make the British people understand Canadian thought and sentiment than any other man who was ever there before him or, I can say, any man who will ever follow him. (Applause) I think you will agree with me that Ontario House was a very miniature duplication of the service which he was rendering at that time, as Canada's High Commissioner in England.

But I got hell. You know I think I own a good portion of that other sphere. Coming over today I sat in the front seat with the taxi driver and he said, "Mr. Premier, how do you stand all the criticism you get?" I said, "There is one consolation, I usually get a spoonful but the other fellow gets a shovelful and I am quite thankful for that." He said, "You know, you are certainly going to have a big slice of hell before you even get there, aren't you?" (Laughter)

Then, we closed this architectural monstrosity, known as Government House, and again I got a little slice of that other region—plenty of it, as a matter of fact. Well, Gentlemen, it isn't any measure of disloyalty to close an institution of that kind. It was costing a lot of money and it was in need of repair. It would cost $100,000, at least, to put it in shape. Can this Canada of ours maintain provincial institutions like that?

I was down in Prince Edward Island. It is a very lovely place, but only a country, in effect. There they have a palatial Lieutenant-Governor's home. We have nine Lieutenant-Governors, receiving $10,000 a year in salary from the Federal authorities—$90,000 in all. Half of that is put up by the taxpayers in the Province of Ontario. We have one representative of the King. We have a very wonderful man in the person of our present Governor-General of Canada, and I think he can perform all the functions necessary in that regard. Closing the house, though we supplied the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario with quite acceptable quarters in the Parliament buildings, closing that and saving you a little money brought down again the wrath of a lot of people upon my head.

So, I say, you can talk about overlapping in government and you try to withdraw some of those services, and watch where you get.

When I cancelled the appointment of all District Medical Health Officers, again I was attacked from all sides. The old order is changed. Thirty or forty years ago, in the days of horses and buggies, it was quite all right to have District Medical Health Officers. That situation has changed. We have Municipal Health Officers and if an epidemic breaks out, we can have serum there, by plane or otherwise, within an hour or two.

When you try to tackle the problem of cutting down the overlapping you bring down the wrath of people upon you.

That is, as I say, the unimportant part of government today. The whole question is, what are we going to do with the ever increasing interest carrying charge? One Treasurer told me, as I said to you, one-half of the revenue in his province was required to meet interest. They can't go on. You couldn't go on as individuals. Let us face it frankly and fairly. You will have to have a national refunding scheme, taking into consideration the problems of the provinces and the Dominion itself. You have got to cut down overhead, whether you like it or not. They have done it in England voluntarily, yes. It is a compact little country, and it hasn't the geographical problems that we have. They have done it in Australia. It has got to be done here, and I wouldn't worry about the three-way bonds. When I converted the new issue, I would say, bonds repayable only in lawful money of Canada.

The problem today is a problem of money. The situation is such that it is necessary for us to give serious thought and consideration and study to this question of monetary reform. I know, when you advocate something of this kind you are looked upon as sort of a halfwit, and they call your ideas "crackpot ideas." I say, like Old Bill, "if you know of a better 'ole, let's hear about it."

I speak as your Treasurer, and I know in the richest province of all, we can't go on indefinitely carrying this present burden of debt and this burden of taxation. There has got to be equality of sacrifice all along the line. We have got to take national stock and inventory. I hear somebody say, "Hear, Hear." It was a wee, small voice, nevertheless I think a lot of you gentlemen are quite in agreement with what I am saying at the present time. (Applause)

It is somewhat like the story of the fellow who had been frequenting one of my beer parlours. I am not looking at anybody in particular, so don't feel guilty. He staggered into a church while an Evangelist was conducting a service. He went to sleep. The Evangelist said, "All those who want to go to Heaven stand up." Everybody stood up but the drunken fellow. The gentleman said, "All those who want to go to the other place, stand up." The noise awakened the sleepy chap and he stood up, and he said, "Parson, I don't know what in the world we are voting on, but I see you and I are in the darned small minority." (Laughter)

Well, Gentlemen, I am going to make this prognostication, that while the ideas I enunciate at this moment in respect to monetary reform may not be popular, my sincere desire is to save our principal. I believe in paying back for value received, and we are not going to be able to do that if we drift along much longer. I say it is time for us to take steps to save the principal. Never mind the interest. Let us save the principal. If we do that now, probably it isn't too late, but three or four years from now when this country is bankrupt, as my official organ, the Globe and Mail, already says it is, you will wonder why we didn't do something of this kind.

When I appeared before the Interprovincial Conference at Ottawa three years ago I advocated this very thing, and I was looked upon as some kind of a bandit. Three years have gone by, we have added hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to our provincial, municipal and federal debt, and if we had taken the steps then the process might have been not quite so painful as it will be a little later on. So I say, let us have courage and backbone to do the things we know are necessary, do the things which are very obvious, because there was never a time when we needed to straighten out our financial house more than at the present.

I notice I have only got four minutes left, and I think probably a lot of you people are very thankful for that.

We are living in a new era. I was out on the Pacific Coast, not so very long ago, with my friend, Jack Bickell. You know, I get criticized for travelling with millionaires, but I was doing something for the province. I had two of them with me. If we had crashed, just think of the income you would have had. Two millionaires in an aeroplane with a tax collector! (Laughter) What a sacrifice for one's country! Out there, my friends, they are worrying about Pacific defence. The world is getting nearer together. Now, I say it is time for us to take stock and inventory, to put our house in order, because we are facing a new problem entirely, that of national defence, and the democracies of the world have got to stand together. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am not kidding myself about it, three nations have agreed upon the conquest of the world. The rest of us have got to stand together and resist inroads from the dictators. We can do that much better if we have our own house in order.

Today I witness the demoralization of the morale of the people of this country because of inability of those in authority to settle our unemployment problems. You can't feed and clothe and house and shelter people indefinitely without breaking their morale. (Applause) That is what we are doing at the present time. We might as well realize that, too. (Applause) The most tragic thing I have witnessed at this moment is the demoralization of the young men of this country. My friends, just think, only a few weeks ago, we witnessed this terrible spectacle of physically fit, single, unemployed men, sheltered and clothed and fed and given medical care out of the pockets of the taxpayer, actually refusing to work seven hours a week beautifying their own city in the way of repayment. Now, years ago those men would have been ashamed to even accept charity but today the situation is changed so completely that these men are even prepared and did picket the City Hall, identifying themselves as those who wouldn't give back to you taxpayers seven hours of work in a whole week, for what you are doing for them.

So, I say, we witness now the demoralization of the youth of this country because of failure on the part of those in authority in Ottawa to deal effectively with this great national problem of unemployment, and there was never a more urgent need of a settlement of this problem than at the present time, because we are faced, as I say, with a new problem, that of national defence.

I don't know, Gentlemen, whether I have trespassed too long upon your time, or jarred the sensibilities of those who think opposite to myself, politically, but at least I have been frank and fair. I have stated exactly what I have in my own mind and I welcome the opportunity of appearing before such a representative group of citizens of Toronto, the city of my adoption. I welcome this opportunity and my friend, the Chairman tells me this is one of the largest gatherings ever assembled under the auspices of the Empire Club of Canada. Now that I have been here and have enjoyed your hospitality, I hope you will extend to me an invitation to return on another occasion. I have enjoyed this event very, very much and I repeat again, I hope I have not jarred the sensibilities of those of the opposite political faith. I hope I haven't said anything that will injure the good feeling so manifest here. After all, I can see that the spirit of good fellowship permeates in the minds of all and, Mr. Chairman, if you are so kind as to invite me again I will be only be too happy to return. I feel very like Harry Lauder. When I heard him in London, Ontario six or seven years ago, he said, "I am now on my fourth farewell tour of Canada, and I will be back again next year."

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Prime Minister, on behalf of the Executive and the members of The Empire Club of Canada, I place before you this piece of paper and hand you a pencil, and ask you to fill in your own date. (Applause)

I am sure that we have all been delighted with the interesting and enlightening remarks of the Prime Minister. It is the first time that I have heard him address a gathering of this size and the fact that he has addressed it with a minimum of notes speaks for itself. We can only hope, Sir, that you will return to us at a very early date and I can assure you that you will have at least as large an audience as you have today.

Before adjourning the meeting, may I on behalf of the Executive extend to all present, and to our radio audience, our best wishes for a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

"WHAT IS THE BRITISH POINT OF VIEW?"

AN ADDRESS BY LIEUT.-COLONEL JAMES MESS

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

January 12, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, at the first meeting in 1939 we are privileged to have as guest at our head table, Mr. Abdullah Usuf Ali, a citizen of our sister Dominion of India. (Applause) I welcome to the head table also most cordially Mr. Victor Smith, President of the Canadian Club of this City, and I also extend a cordial welcome to those members of his Club who are here to hear one of their Past Presidents speak to The Empire Club. (Applause)

Our speaker, Lieutenant-Colonel James Mess, is a very modest man. You have seen the information regarding him which appears on the card, and in conversation with him today it has been impossible for me to supplement that information by one single word. He was born in Scotland—a good start—and after having adopted Canada as his land for the future he practised his profession of engineering until the outbreak of war, when he went overseas. Following a very brilliant career, he returned to Canada. Since that time he has continued the practice of his profession. He has had to make numerous trips overseas where he has had ample opportunity of gaining impressions and gaining information which permits him to speak to us with authority today upon the subject which he has chosen.

You will notice the subject, "What is the British Point of View?" gives him ample scope, and I have told Colonel Mess that he has the full freedom of speech in this room to tell us what is the British point of view. I have much pleasure in introducing to you Lieutenant-Colonel James Mess. Colonel Mess. (Applause)

COLONEL JAMES MESS: Thank you, Mr. President and Gentlemen.

Perhaps the title of my address is ill-chosen. It either presupposes my ability to furnish you with an answer, or your readiness to define. The best to be hoped for is that my words to follow will assist us both in reaching conclusions and in interpreting news of international importance without too much criticism of the actions of our Mother Country. Our independent Canadian spirit demands we criticize. Let us do so intelligently. I flatter myself that I have the average intelligence and that my problem is similar to yours, namely, how can I translate the international situation from the broadcasts of paid commentators, articles by foreign correspondents, however unbiased, or through listening to public criticisms, criticisms in the most part engendered by prejudice rather than by appreciation of motivating ideas.

Most of us are familiar with that very interesting picture, "Lloyd's of London," reminding us of how the privileged few, through the services of carrier pigeons, secured news of world events ahead of the common people. Today an event of international importance is known to the whole world in a matter of moments. A man may be shot in the streets of Prague one day and we have a photograph of the incident in our next morning's paper. Speed of communications has far outrun our ability of absorption. We are quite bewildered.

Primarily, at this time, our thoughts turn to the probability of war. What will Hitler do, and Mussolini? What is Britain's plan? Has she one? Will she ever be prepared? Are we losing prestige? A hundred and one questions which we cannot attempt to answer without a point of view to help us. We must not only have a point of view, but we must acknowledge the change in conditions during the last twenty-five years. Before the Great War a slight insult from a foreigner would be just cause for an embarrassing international situation, probably leading to war, but I suggest a war of definite location with only minor effect on our homes and families. The years 1914-1918 left us with such a tragic picture that our desire to knock the proverbial chip off someone's shoulder is much tempered, not through fear of our own safety but through the knowledge that such action might involve the whole world with definite menace to those nearest and dearest to us. Developments in speed of transportation have placed our foes, imaginary or otherwise, on our front lawn, or in our backyard. These changed conditions must be thoroughly appreciated in the talk which I now hope to give you.

On what foundation can we establish our conclusions, right or wrong? What are we going to do about the British point of view if we don't know what the British point of view is? A point of view which has baffled friends and foes alike for time eternal.

First of all I claim we are Britishers. Anyone who doubts or questions that parentage might well ponder over the heavy burden now being carried by those little islands across the sea, partly on our behalf, a burden which sometimes seems well nigh intolerable. As Britishers we have certain characteristics. Do these characteristics not furnish the formula for the British point of view?

I am always impressed, on my many visits to the States, by their appreciation of what they consider the British sense of justice. This appreciation is partly one of relativity and partly, since prohibition, perhaps one of envy. They seem to feel that a Britisher is beyond breaking the law, and always stands up for what is right. I take no issue with that verdict, but suggest a partial reservation. Is the Britisher's attitude not more one of inevitability, rather than one of right or wrong? We can think of many instances of this inevitability picture, particularly throughout our war experiences and since, though, unfortunately, we have to look on them as surmises, as no proof is publicly available.

I wonder if the British Government was not much relieved through the inadvertent sinking of the German battleships at Scapa Flow, while awaiting distribution among the Allies, under the terms of the Versailles Treaty? Could equitable distribution have been made? What a coincidence!

Great Britain has been many times criticized for her lack of interest in the Japanese-Chinese war now raging. Would Japan not have been a greater menace before this war to international peace than she can possibly be now? Was civil war inevitable? Would China, even to a minor degree, have solved her banditry problem? Will Chinese markets not be more settled for British interests after peace comes? Were all these questions of right or wrong, or of inevitability?

And what of the war debts? What might have been the world economic position today had Great Britain's suggestion for the cancellation of war debts been generally accepted? Right or wrong? No—inevitability.

My next characteristic, I hope, will not be misinterpreted. How many of us are prepared to make fools of ourselves, or as we say, be made the goat for the sake of our objective? How many of our political leaders today, to use an American term, will "take the rap" with the full thought and intent that their final objective is for the benefit of their country? I claim that this willingness to be made the goat is the difference between the politician and the statesman. The statesman stays with his convictions, regardless of loss of prestige, temporary or otherwise. The politician has a flexible mind which can be bent to suit the situation for the protection of his own political fortunes. Every statesman in Britain is apparently prepared to be made the goat.

You have heard discussed frequently that terrible blunder of the Hoare-Laval pact. While Mr. Baldwin took full responsibility for that very difficult situation, what is the present status of the statesmen then involved? A blunder? I don't think so. Were we not successful in securing the co-operation of the small nations in the Mediterranean pact through this so-called blunder?

Let us take Mr. Chamberlain's recent flight to Munich. Let us not look with favour or disfavour on his actions, but appreciate this as an excellent example of being made the goat, if necessary.

And then we have the well-known proverb, "Time Cures All." I know of no nation in the world with a greater appreciation of the value of time than the British. We and our friends to the south of us frequently brag of our accomplishments between the hours of eight and six. I venture to suggest that the Britisher accomplishes more between the hours of ten and four. To cram as much as we can into a twenty-four hour day is not necessarily a knowledge of the value of time. He is prepared to wait. He knows that when people have time to think, they sometimes lose their animosity and—well, he was not such a bad fellow after all.

We have our present indications of the value of time in the breathing space which Mr. Chamberlain is asking for under the present conditions. We perhaps can criticize the reasons for that breathing space, but no one seems to deny the necessity.

To return also to the question of the sinking of the German battleships. Was that not an indication of the value of time?

I know of no nation more ready to cut off the festered finger to save the hand. A situation requiring drastic treatment is handled immediately, as evidenced by Britain's acceptance of the present war budget, and of the enormous increase in taxes, however coated with the sugar called National Defence Contribution.

But we must admit the value of time element may have many disadvantages. I personally have suffered from bombarding the doors of business and Governmental institutions, worrying against the aggravated and unexplained delays. Who has not?

My fourth characteristic perhaps hardly needs suggestion. It is that there are two sides to every question. Perhaps this can be construed as Britain's sense of justice. At least it is necessary in the correct evaluation of any problem.

Then we have the long term view. It seems that a British statesman seldom thinks in terms of less than a generation. Perhaps that is why many of us are prone to criticize the actions of the moment rather than their effect on the future. How much was Britain criticized for her generosity to the Boers? Think of the results today. Think of Mr. Hore-Belisha's problem, the reorganization of the army, a job for which perhaps he was particularly fitted, though it may ultimately mean his downfall. Senior, experienced officers, relieved without apparent reason. Was it not his intent that officers creating the present Defence and Offence schemes should be those who would carry them out in the event of a war within the period of the next ten or fifteen years. A long term view? Perhaps.

Again, we come to war debts. Most of you are familiar with the Britishers' long term view of financial manipulation. Perhaps some of the younger nations have on occasions thrown monkey wrenches into the works, but most assuredly London has retrieved her position as the financial centre of the world.

My sixth characteristic—Faith. Some may interpret this as arrogance, but at least it is faith in the ultimate, whatever comes in between.

Then, we have "a sense of humour," from the lowest to the highest. I was walking along Piccadilly the other day and overheard one newsboy remark to another, "Hey, Bill, what did you do in the relief of 'yde Park?"

Immediately following the crisis, one well-known London newspaper called for interesting or amusing comments which had been overheard during those trying hours. One appealed to me particularly on account of its brevity and apparently unconscious depth of experience. Two charladies were talking and one said to the other: "Why doesn't this 'ere 'itler fellow get married and settle down?"

My last characteristic, though there are many more worthy of comment, is the Britisher's ability to forego rancour, and his belief that when a foe is vanquished he should not be trampled on. Coupled with this is his ability to fight, regardless of results, and return to friendship when reconciliation seems least possible.

I can think of so many instances which describe that characteristic. Perhaps the one best known to us is the

Versailles Treaty. Was Britain whole-heartedly in accord with its terms? It has been said Germany deserved the punishment she got. How often can we afford today to punish the offender according to the crime? I venture to say that in no instance can we afford to punish a nation appropriately. Too many others are involved and the result may be the reverse of what was intended.

How often the statement has been made that had we been in Germany's place, worse would have happened to us. Perhaps that is true. Perhaps we would have been in revolt today instead of Germany. I make these remarks without prejudice, with a hope of clearer vision.

Many of you read the beautifully worded comments of Atticus, in a recent issue of The Financial Post, where he described an angry situation between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill during a debate in the House, where apparently a gulf had been created between these two men that was unbridgeable. Within three hours Mr. Chamberlain during debate remarked: "I cannot agree with my Right Honourable friend"—he paused and with a smile turned to Mr. Churchill—"if I may still call him so." Mr. Churchill, whose magnanimity is as great as his power of mischief, half rose to his feet, and murmured, with a bow of his head, "If I am not unworthy, Sir." (Applause)

May I sum up the foregoing by asking you to accept this homemade formula for the British point of view: Determine what is inevitable; pursue without rancour at whatever personal sacrifice necessary, with all justice possible, and regardless of ridicule or criticism, confident in the ultimate results.

Where is all this leading us? Primarily we are Britishers and if, as Britishers, we can accept the British point of view or at least construe our thoughts along British lines, surely we can be of much greater value. The British characteristics are bound to be the basis on which the British point of view is formed and cannot we, if we can absorb this, even to the smallest degree, be of value in supporting her statesmen, giving her support without in any way relinquishing our right to criticize? Surely we can criticize more intelligently and yet retain our independence.

No people in the world criticize their Government more than the British. Can you imagine any man receiving more adulation than came to Mr. Chamberlain after his flight to Munich? Could anyone be criticized so severely by many today than that same gentleman? Let us not look on his action with criticism or approval, but look on them as an excellent example of the British point of view. Here is a man of inflexible nature, bearing a burden probably ill prepared for him by his predecessors, sizing up a situation with cold-blooded efficiency, treading a determined path of peace; if not peace, victory. The head of a well-known London publishing house, in sizing up the situation to me, while deploring all this criticism, asked me point blank, "How easy would you find it to play poker with your own money as against calling a bluff with a million lives?" I think perhaps that helps to size up that particular situation.

Let us not forget, while we are studying characteristics, the following conditions: How often have you been asked, "How can the Germans be content to live under the strict Nazi regime, as we know it, with complete repression of ideas and opinions, and strict regimentation? How can the Italians be reconciled to their controlled life and lack of freedom under Mussolini?" Is it not a question of how bad conditions were before, not how bad they are now? My frequent visits to Germany since the war demand that I indicate to you the enormous improvements in that country, while still deploring some of the methods used, conditions which to properly evaluate we must consider in the light of the German point of view as against our own, and the geographical locations of Germany and Italy as against ours. We must think of the underlying reasons and ideas for the formation of these dictatorships before we criticize bluntly, without knowledge.

Many say, how can we possibly co-operate with a madman? Hitler is no madman. And I cannot recall a single instance during my conversations in London when any thinking man was prepared to make such an implication. They all give credit for his marvellous political strategy and timing, and the results obtained through bluff or otherwise. One cannot underestimate one's opponent or relieve the situation by belittling his prowess. Word of mouth may not be the same as actions, as time has shown in this instance, and however much we deplore the methods, the results have been astounding. Future results must be considered in the light of their enormity and nothing must be taken for granted. Time itself will probably alter Germany's internal picture.

Unpreparedness! That is the whole story today. Admiral Keyes, some months ago, made no reservation about intimating the weakness of the army and the navy. Surely Mr. Daladier had no delusions about the possible effect of strikes on the French armament production, and did Russia support whole-heartedly her original pledge to Czecho-Slovakia? The Czech situation looks very much to me like an excellent example of there being two sides to every question. Would you have been prepared to call a bluff under all those conditions?

How many businessmen, and I find few in London, had made preparations for the last crisis? Yet those same gentlemen were prepared to criticize their Government for being so unprepared.

Unpreparedness! One is shocked to see the unfinished bomb shelters in the beautiful parks of London, left as they were within a moment of the crisis being over. What a peculiar opposite to the fevered heat of armament and aircraft production now under way, however late. Word comes to us from all sides of new ideas against invasion, ideas not mentioned or heard of months ago. One leaves London with a very definite impression of a determined public picture of unpreparedness and a growing strength within, supporting Mr. Chamberlain's viewpoint: Victory, if no peace.

I can remember some words of Herr Hitler's quite a while ago when he stated that Germany as a vanquished nation or a vacuum would be infinitely more dangerous than as a re-established country. I find that to be one of the outstanding views of many of our statesmen, though everyone is willing to admit that the pendulum may overswing with somewhat disastrous results.

It is at this stage of my address that I would like to run amuck. Unfortunately, in the last twenty-four hours we have had a sufficient number of people doing this, both from the Old Country and to the south of us. To make any prognostication of the future would be impertinent, but opinion, as I gathered it, definitely points to a crisis this coming spring and a more severe crisis early in 1940.

What can we Canadians—Britishers—do but prepare for this crisis, put our houses and our businesses in order and realize the necessity for a very closely-knit Empire, ready for whatever the future may hold.

If you will permit me in closing, I should like to read an extract from Beverley Baxter's book, "Westminster Watchtower":

"You have heard that British prestige has been trampled in the mud, and that the British flag is held in contempt by nations glorying in their own strength. Nor do I deny the humiliations that have aroused the deepest resentment in all of us who have British blood in our veins. Yet, when I travelled across Europe shortly after the events of that fateful week end, I found the name of Britain held in such esteem and in such honour in one country after another that I was moved to a pride of citizenship I could not have expressed in words.

"Nor was it, as might be thought, merely because Britain had shown such unexpected resolution over Czecho-Slovakia. I found instead a feeling of respect and gratitude that there was one great nation which had the strength of a giant but would not use it as a tyrant, a nation where people were free to come and go, a nation which hated war and would endure to the uttermost for peace, a nation where freedom was master and the

State existed to ensure the rights of the individual.

"In Germany and Austria I encountered this deep respect as well as in Roumania and Czecho-Slovakia. 'England can come with a corporal's guard,' said a minister of one of the Balkan countries, 'and all Europe will follow her.'

"My friends who have been to Spain tell me the same thing. Both sides say that Britain has not tried to advantage herself or injure Spain because of her civil war. They say that they will remember that in the years to come.

"Perhaps it was this knowledge that caused a strange and moving scene in the House of Commons in the closing days of the last session. We had met for the last Foreign Affairs debate. It was opened by the Opposition Liberal, Sir Archibald Sinclair, who trained his guns on the Government Front Bench where Mr. Chamberlain sat with his colleagues, tired but imperturbable, waiting for the shells to explode.

"For twenty minutes the bombardment went on when, suddenly, Sinclair stopped. Leaning forward and speaking with a strange gentleness, he said:

" 'I am sure the thought uppermost in the mind of the Prime Minister—whose courage and industry in shouldering this heavy burden of responsibility we all admire, however much we dissent from his policy—is the preservation of peace.'

"The mere words do scant justice to the sincerity and kindliness of Sinclair's manner. Chamberlain looked up startled, then suddenly covered his face with his hands. Sinclair said some stumbling words as if to ease the situation, but the eyes of the whole House were on the Prime Minister. For a full minute he sat there with his face buried in his hands. When he at last straightened himself up and looked across the floor of the House, there were still tears in his eyes.

"Half an hour later he rose to make his poorest speech of the session. Kindness had broken down the defences which had withstood all ridicule. For so many months he had borne the weight of supreme responsibility and endured alike the humiliation of events and the sneers of his critics, yet never once had asked for patience or for pity.

"Then one of his opponents, in a moment of generosity, had revealed the simple humanity of the man who was supposed to be without emotion."

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Victor Smith, the President of the Canadian Club, has kindly agreed to express our thanks.

MR. V. R. SMITH: Mr. President and Members of The Empire Club of Canada: Before thanking Colonel Mess, may I first say "thank you" to you, The Empire Club, and to your President for the courtesy which you have paid me and The Canadian Club in inviting me to be a guest at your head table today, and finally, to voice your thanks to a Past President of The Canadian Club for his very timely address.

It is the part of prudence on the part of us all, whether we believe we shall be able to avoid war or not, to take stock of ourselves, because it seems if we must face the ordeal of war once again, we must show that we are British and that we intend to remain part of the British Empire. But whether we are so fortunate as to be citizens of that Empire or of one of the other great democracies, we must remember that if the reign of law and order which has been maintained by the British for hundreds of years is to be broken down we face chaos and the rule of the jungle.

It is therefore very fitting that we should listen to speeches such as you have given us today, Colonel Mess, reviewing the characteristics of the British, so sturdy that they have stood the test of time in building up an international reign of law and enabling them to be the leaders of international law and order. Those sturdy characteristics which have enabled the British to do this and what they are doing day by day and our responsibility to the British in their difficulties at the present time are things that we shall ponder over as a result of the questions that you have raised today.

We thank you, Colonel Mess, for the very timely and illuminating review of British characteristics and their responsibility at this time, which we have all listened to with interest and close attention.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

"CAN WE ACHIEVE CANADIAN UNITY?"

AN ADDRESS BY

MONSIEUR JEAN-CHARLES HARVEY.

Chairman—The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, January 19, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Today, we extend a most cordial welcome to a citizen of our sister Province of Quebec, in the person of Monsieur Jean-Charles Harvey, formerly Editor-in-Chief of "Le Soleil" in Quebec, and more recently the founder and Editor of "Le Jour," a French weekly newspaper published in the City of Montreal. Though Monsieur Harvey's present paper, "Le Jour," is only eighteen months old, his writings have been quoted in the general press of the Dominion to such an extent that it is now regarded as the most quoted journal in Canada.

One of Monsieur Harvey's constant efforts is to strengthen inter-Provincial unity and at a time like this any discussion upon a subject of that kind cannot fail to be most interesting He is a staunch Canadian, with a true sense of heartfelt loyalty to the British Empire. He is constantly urging his fellow-Canadians of the French language to learn English. He insists also upon the teaching of good French and on the beauty of French culture which—especially, he suggests, if we of the English-speaking population of Canada will learn French—will have an important bearing upon the development of a truly Canadian culture.

I have much pleasure in introducing Monsieur Jean-Charles Harvey, who has taken as his subject, "French-Canadian Relationships with the Rest of the Dominion."

(Applause)

M. JEAN-CHARLES HARVEY: Mr. President, Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Let me thank you for having given me this occasion of visiting again your great and progressive City of Toronto, and to speak of the good understanding between Ontario and Quebec.

Can we achieve Canadian unity? There will always be people who care more for disunion and disagreement than for peace and good understanding. It is hard to find perfect accord even in a family. Disputes between husband and wife, father and sons, brothers and sisters, are of more frequent occurrence than we realize. And so, when I come to discuss with you means of cementing Canadian unity, I come with no illusions. I know as well as anybody that there will always be friction between the members of the Canadian family, and that the most we can hope to do is to erect a few shock-absorbers at key spots in the nation.

In the case of the Canadian family the problem is more difficult in that we are not all of the same character. We went through remarriage in 1759. Part of the children belong to a second mother, so that between us —as half-brothers and half-sisters, as sons-in-law, and daughters-in-law of a mother-in-law—relations are more or less strained.

This is a fact we must keep fixed in our minds while we are considering the delicate question of Canadian unity. It is true that most of our disagreements — or, rather, our misunderstandings—are grounded on prejudice or on ignorance, neither of which can be eliminated at a stroke. It is true, also, that there are many English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians of enlightened goodwill who earnestly seek better relations with each other. The duty of those Canadians on both sides of the language barrier who are sincerely anxious for unity is to keep on, patiently and tolerantly, working at the same problem.

Why, after all, should we be surprised because misunderstandings exist between Quebec and the rest of Canada? It would be more surprising if there were none. From the beginning of time man has been divided not so much by geographical as by moral frontiers—and the moral frontiers are those of language, of religion, of tradition, of historical remembrance, of schooling, and of ancient grudges. Because of these differences, millions of men have died in wars and persecutions all down the centuries, thousands of ingenious modes of torture have been devised and applied to coerce men's minds, and even today, in certain totalitarian states resort is being had to every excess on grounds of beliefs, of hypotheses or of chauvinism.

Wise men and dreamers had faith, at the beginning of this century of light, that mankind, having reached a new high point in civilization, was ready at last to observe the simple, salutary laws of human thought, human reason and human sentiment.

We thought we were rid of old mythologies from which most of our ills have grown. But apparently the human race is so tainted with defeatism as to prefer its ancient sores and pains to the cleanness of peace and friendship. We are perhaps still too close to our primitive ancestors, who saw an enemy behind every bush, who dared not go beyond the door unarmed.

These few truths, based on history and experience, show how arduous a problem it is we tackle, every time we speak of Canadian unity. There exist in this country two main ethnic groups which speak different languages, profess different religions, have different historic backgrounds, frequent totally different schools and are even ruled by different governments. No people on earth can be afflicted with more and deeper sources of misunderstanding. We have just about a perfect set-up for trouble; and that set-up is being sturdily defended, firmly maintained and assiduously cultivated. In nations so organized you will always find groups of individuals and institutions who live off feuds, who rely upon divisions among men for support of their power and authority and who consequently are vitally interested in preventing the development between the diverse ethnic elements in the country, of those various points of contact which you must have if you are to create a nation, one and indivisible.

Of course points of contact do exist to a certain extent between the elites of our various groups, notwithstanding determined efforts to keep us apart. But the masses on both sides are strangers to one another; and among those masses ancient prejudice is steadily working toward national decomposition, gradually paralyzing whatever serious attempts are being made to secure active collaboration and collective progress.

It would take too long to review here the balance sheet of mistakes made in our Confederation on the English as well as on the French side. On the side of the English-speaking Canadians there are altogether too many who have tried to make French-speaking Canadians feel that their language and traditions survived only on sufferance, too many who have sought to deny to the descendants of the first Europeans settled in Canada their right to maintain their own personality in all parts of the Dominion, too many who have deliberately kept them in subordinate positions in the public service and in certain important industries.

The people of Quebec, and their fellow French-speaking compatriots in the other provinces consider themselves the first Canadians. In strict justice, of course, their claim is not as valid as that of the Redskins. If realism were the only consideration influencing public policy and national development, it might be possible—at great cost and perhaps after civil war—to enforce against the descendants of the early French settlers the policy of oppression those settlers applied to the Indians. The stronger, more realistic nationality in the first instance all but wiped out the weaker—though our history books, both French and English, gloss that over in a hurry.

But modern democracies—and we are one—can no longer condone brutal, even thoughtless treatment of minorities. English-speaking Canadians must remember that as long as we remain a liberty-loving nation, the sort of tactics which lack of tact and of understanding has led them to adopt in the past, will violate the essential principles on which our national life must rest.

The mistakes made already on both sides may well cost the country dear in years to come. For if the English-speaking majority in Canada has blundered, French-speaking Canadians have no clean sheet either. They have frequently put their own racial interests and sentimental mysticism ahead of the general well-being of the country, ahead of those factors of universal humanity which ought to guide us in all our actions. In other words, we have fed at times on a sort of false nationalism—really provincialism and regionalism—which has greatly limited our horizons and which, as we realize today, has appreciably delayed not only our economic but our intellectual development.

In the last two or three years talk has been heard of a separatist movement in Quebec, aimed at the establishment of a French state along the St. Lawrence River. The trend, as you know, has been denounced by all authorities, civil and religious. Its followers are only a few people. It has even lost much ground in the last year, thanks to the merciless war we and our collaborators have waged in our paper against the Separatist idea, sown in the first instance by an eloquent and distinguished priest, and taken up for a time by several thousand patriotic young men. The group is now to all intents and purposes impotent, but we must not lull ourselves into thinking that the idea behind it is entirely dead. Another economic crisis, for example, would probably revive it.

Since most of the leading enterprises in our province are in the hands of English, English-Canadian or American corporations, it is only natural that the people, in times of depression and suffering, should throw the blame for their troubles on employers and producers who are known as capitalists. That is where demagogues and exploiters of racial feeling come into the picture.

They had little difficulty for a while in persuading Quebec crowds that the enemy was the Englishman, that it was he who had kept French Canada in a state of misery and that the best way to get rid of him would be by breaking away from the rest of the country and setting up a distinct social and economic organization of our own. These ideas were propagated during the last crisis. They may come again during the next one and grow still more intense and more troublesome. There, as I see it, is one of the greatest dangers threatening the unity of our homeland.

There is another disquieting element. A wave of nationalism is ravaging ancient Europe. Everybody knows how the leaders of totalitarian states, first class demagogues all of them, have influenced their people primarily with exalted ideas of nation, race, national grandeur and supremacy. They have fostered a racial superiority complex which has turned the heads of youth. Unfortunately, their success has encouraged nationalist movements in other parts of the world. A people like that of French Canada found the example easy to grasp and to imitate. Hence we have, in the Province of Quebec, a host of advocates of Fascism in the manner of Italy, of Germany, of Portugal and even of Japan. Here again, of course, we are dealing with the minority, and I hasten to emphasize that in order to reassure you. But this nationalistic contagion, though the Pope himself has condemned it, is reacting more strongly in Quebec than anywhere else in North America. On this continent, outside of Quebec, this disease of narrow nationalism or regionalism is more or less a new thing. The United States, in the course of a century, received millions of immigrants, seeking shelter from crushing traditions, old habits and distasteful ways of life. Once they reached this side of the ocean, the now Americans were only too anxious to forget their ancient motherlands and to identify themselves with their new land, appreciating the privilege of a common tongue and the freedom of their adopted country. Now all that is changing. The former subjects of the totalitarian states are being ordered to preserve their ethnic identity. Germans must remain Germans whether they live in Canada, in the United States or anywhere else; the same with Italians. Those who have been here only a few generations, who still have relations or friends "back home," are ruled, regimented and spied upon from afar by the dictators. I have friends who employ German maids. They tell me those servants are subjected to all the nationalistic pestering and all the propaganda of their native lands. I consider this a new danger, a new sore spot we must keep an eye on. If we do not want this country to become a checkerboard of various races, a sort of crazy quilt, we must take energetic measures to assimilate the elements which come to us from abroad. If assimilation is resisted, well—we must order those new subjects who seek to maintain a state within the State, back where they come from. (Applause) We cannot allow them to contaminate us with new factors of national disunity. We have enough troubles now without taking on new ones.

I seem to be wandering from my subject, but I wanted to give some examples of how, in recent years, circumstances have favoured a recrudescence of narrow nationalism among certain parts of the youth of the Province of Quebec. The economic crisis on the one hand and the example of the Fascist state on the other have contributed more than a little. It is to be hoped that the house of cards erected overseas by political gangsters will soon collapse, so we may return to a more normal, more realistic and more accurate conception of things and of men.

I must say that nobody has the right to condemn the French-speaking Canadians for struggling nearly two centuries against formidable elements to keep alive their language, their traditions, their faith and their identity. They have shown a great deal of nobility and courage in doing it. If we can some day unite in our lands the descendants of the two greatest European civilizations of modern times without destroying the essential qualities of either French or British blood, we shall have accomplished probably one of the finest feats in human history. But if these two elements fail to come together, if they will not work together to form a powerful, respected nation, the result will be that by clinging obstinately to our respective positions we shall have aggravated the ferments of hatred, of discord and of suffering we have now. We shall also have held back progress in our part of America and retarded the attainment of human happiness.

Now, I have written and said repeatedly that we have no right, merely for the purpose of preserving secondary ethnical characteristics, to honour legends, to cherish vague sentimentality or to sow seeds of desolation and misery among millions of poor folk who ask for nothing more than a decent living and a chance to get a little more comfort and well-being out of life. We have not the right, for the purpose of keeping faith with an empty nationalistic formula, to sacrifice men and women. Go back as far as you like in history; every time it has been tried, misery has resulted. In a word, any over-accentuation of national traditionalism, born of sterile theory and essentially inimical to the spirit of progress, must necessarily lead, if it be prolonged, to collapse.

There is one contribution French-speaking Canada could make right away to the cause of national unity which would in no sense run counter to the basic traditions of our nationality. We used to be one of the greatest pioneering races of the world. Practically the entire continent of North America, if we except the Atlantic coastline between New England and Florida, and the Pacific states and provinces, was discovered and opened to civilization by men from what is now the Province of Quebec. But the qualities of daring, initiative and endurance which were so characteristic of early French Canada are not being applied today to the equally difficult, equally taxing problems of modern progress because nothing has been done to call them out and train them in the light of changed conditions.

I am confident that the establishment of an adequate practical system of education in French Canada would soon prepare our people to resume in the field of industry, trade and finance, the pioneering rôle they once played in the opening of the North American frontiers to settlement and trade. The realistic students of Canadian history cannot fail to grasp one essential fact: our first explorers, coureurs-de-bois and fur traders were more preoccupied with problems of business expansion and national development along practical lines than with considerations of tradition, politics and language. When they wanted to deal with the Indians they learned Indian and talked it. Many of them married Indian wives. All of them adapted themselves, in their personal habits as well as their work, to conditions as they found them, in the country they opened and civilized. If our people can possess again the qualities of their ancestors I am sure they will form the strongest national element in North America and they will contribute strongly also to Canadian unity.

But there are other reasons than merely provincial or ethnic reasons. The Fathers of Confederation set out to forge a nation out of the scattered settlements and waste areas in Canada. They did the best they could. There can be no doubt their dream was to build a strong, united country, but the obstacles in their way were tremendous. The wonder is not that they accomplished so little; it is that they accomplished anything at all, for the racial feuds and sectional jealousies which are so obvious today were running strong and perhaps stronger in their time.

Unfortunately, the public men who succeeded them either would not or could not stem the tide and divert the current of Canadian development into a more unified channel. The powers assigned in the British North America Act to the Federal authority have been weakened, not strengthened, and the prerogatives reserved for the Provinces, instead of being diminished have been increased to the point where the whole framework erected by the Fathers of Confederation is threatened with disruption. Not only Quebec and Ontario but even provinces in the West which were not parties to the original pact, are encroaching more and more, in the name of autonomy, upon the central power.

The Provinces, originally the daughters of Confederation, are now in process of devouring their mother. Every year more and more of our prestige is being stripped from her. In the central government itself, sometimes through excessive political caution, sometimes through rank indifference or even cowardice, has been let go by default many an essential prerogative.

Our central government is powerless to amend the Constitution without the consent of the provinces and so it cannot deal with all sorts of serious anomalies which ought to be adjusted at once, and the provinces are taking advantage of the situation in a big way. We saw a tragic example of this only last year. When the Rowell Commission, appointed to inquire into means of improving relations between the provinces and the Dominion, sought the collaboration of local administrations, it met with rebuffs in the two leading provinces of the country because both Premiers were politically hostile to the central government of the day — perhaps because they were politicians first and Canadians afterward.

The leaders of Canadian life who followed Confederation have worked centrifugally rather than centripetally, with the result that we are farther away than ever from having national schools in Canada, and the gulf between our two leading nationalities has been widened instead of narrowed. The natural tendency of French-speaking Canadians to think in terms of principles, of generalizations, has been aggravated in a water-tight school system which has stubbornly resisted all efforts so far made to liberalize it. Conversely, the English-speaking schools have drifted more and more into a sort of mechanized mass-production which perhaps ignores the cultural side of life too much. So no advantage has resulted from the great contribution of practical common sense which the English-speaking people of the Dominion could have made to French-speaking school children, and the leavening effect which French culture could have had on the minds of Anglo-Saxon Canadian children has been unhappily lost.

If differences in language and cultural background are the greatest factors of our division and disruption it may be necessary for Canadians throughout the country to begin planning practical steps which will bring them closer together.

Here I think the press of the Dominion has a great rôle to play. Our English-language newspapers and magazines could easily carry more news of French Canada. They could report political, social, economic, cultural, educational and institutional happenings in Quebec more generally and far more thoroughly than they do. Even the English-language dailies in Montreal have consistently closed their eyes to a great news field which they could have exploited for the benefit of all Canada. Your magazines could publish articles by French-speaking Canadians discussing Canadian problems from the Quebec point of view. You might not agree with the principles expressed in those articles, but at least you would know what three million Canadians are thinking, planning and hoping. Similarly, our French press could open its columns more freely to translations and summaries of articles written by English-speaking Canadians, and so help to broaden Quebec's understanding of the problem of other provinces.

If language differences are the main obstacle in our way, we must do something about the language problem, of course, but what? Is Canada to become a bilingual country from coast to coast? A French country? An English country? I make no recommendation. Probably it would be best if all of us could speak both languages, and I believe that the principle of bilingualism is gaining everywhere in the country from coast to coast.

We must also compare the respective advantages of both languages. English is essentially the commercial language of the modern world. On this continent more than 145 million persons use it almost excusively. In the Orient where perhaps Canada's greatest market will some day be found it is the secondary language of millions of people. Most of the world's trade is carried on in it. It is the tongue spoken in the most prosperous countries on earth, I believe. We might almost say that people who use it seem automatically to develop the highest standard of material existence. In the main, English-speaking men and women find it difficult to learn other languages. This is probably not a credit to them, but it is a peculiarity the existence of which we must acknowledge if we want to be both fair and practical.

French, on the other hand, possesses a native beauty and a wealth of literature which no properly cultured person can afford to ignore. It is the secondary language of most European and South American nations. Canadians who use it as their mother tongue are multiplying very rapidly—more rapidly than any other ethnic group in the country. The day may be not far distant when the natural increase of the French-speaking Canadians will automatically make French the leading Canadian language. The present majority may well become a minority in another half century, and then—well, the language problem will solve itself.

We had a mayoralty election in Montreal not long ago and one of the candidates made much of the fact that he was the father of fourteen children. This is no uncommon family in the Province of Quebec. Suppose ten of the gentleman's fourteen children should marry. Suppose each of them averages eight offspring — of course they will have less than the father—that will give our candidate eighty grandchildren. Now, allowing for a greater decrease in the French-Canadian birthrate than is likely, let us say sixty of the eighty grandchildren marry and that they average only six children each. Mr. Gascon would then be the progenitor of four hundred and fifty-four direct descendants.

How long at this rate before French becomes the dominant language in Canada and the problems we are discussing today are settled by sheer weight of numbers? Unless—and here I enter upon controversial ground—unless Canada's immigration policies are drastically changed in the next few years.

Canada has an opportunity today that may never be repeated. Capital and populations in Europe are worried about the danger of war. Billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of people are eager to get away from the unhappy continent into the free, friendly air of North America, to reconstruct in our New World lives which have become precarious in the Old. There is in this condition an advantage for Canada which it would be foolish for us to neglect. Ours is a rich, large country not only able to support increased population but suffering from the fact that there are not enough of us to maintain the social and industrial structure we have built too great for ourselves. We must at all costs have more people, especially when you consider that our birthrate is falling and will fall gradually. Unless we get more people we shall become more and more subject to competition and envy from more populous nations whose natural advantages are less than ours and we shall become less and less able to exert through the world the influence we ought to exert.

There is still time for us, I believe, to fill some of the vacant spaces in Canada with the type of population we want and can assimilate, selected by ourselves, before people whom we do not want take advantage of our numerical weakness and help themselves to that which we are not using.

It requires no particular effort of memory to recall that Canada's greatest prosperity came in the days when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power and migration was pouring into Canada at the rate of 300,000 a year. Migrants in large numbers did not take away our jobs, they created activity. New markets were developed, building boomed throughout the land. Newcomers took over menial jobs from native sons and Canadians went up in the social and economic scale, for the immigrant goes to the bottom, performs the heavy jobs while he is learning citizenship, and so lifts the rest of the population to higher levels of existence.

Every Canadian knows also that the United States owes its predominant position in the world to a phenomenal development based on immigration, energy, and the willingness to accept new ideas.

We have read recently in news despatches that the Argentine has been asserting itself and standing up to the United States in Pan-American relations. You never hear of Canada talking that way to Uncle Sam, or anybody else. Why? Because the Argentine is a fast-growing country, sure of itself and strong in its progressiveness, while we live in an atmosphere of constant bickering, hesitation and self-questioning.

The area of the Argentine is only 1,135,840 square miles, against Canada's 3,694,863 square miles, and we have vastly more natural resources. In 1895 its population was only 3,954,000, when ours was 5,026,000. But today there are 12,762,000 people in the Argentine Republic, while the Dominion of Canada has only 11,120,000.

I have digressed somewhat from my theme, though the problem of immigration is certainly closely related to that of national unity in that any lessening of the economic strain upon the present population, which will result from distributing the load over more shoulders, is bound to ease many of the tensions now irritating our people.

One of these sources of tension is the fact that many of us Canadians know so little about the rest of the country. There are relatively few Quebeckers who are familiar with Ontario, and on the other hand, relatively few Ontarians know Quebec. I have friends who have been to Paris five times, yet they have never seen Toronto. Have they been warned against the Sundays of that City? But the fact remains that many Canadians are ready to visit the United States, France and Japan and India before they see anything of their own land. An extremely intelligent, well-educated young man, trained in the school of Nationalism, said to me last fall, "What can Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver mean to us? As far as we are concerned they do not exist because we don't know them. We can feel no loyalty except to our own Laurentians." Many Canadians, English as well as French-speaking, feel pretty much the same way, though they may not be as frank to say so as bluntly as our young patriot.

I see only one remedy for this: organized trips through the country in every direction and to grant every year a certain number of bursaries for travel within Canada. Our governments might well initiate tours designed to make parts of our territory better known to such classes of young people as college and high school graduates, teachers and specialists of all kinds. Since this is a matter of national importance the Federal Government should take the lead. Ottawa would make itself popular and at the same time would be helping to tighten the bonds between the provinces. It would be so beneficial to everybody. Can the rational man fail to be impressed with the greatness and the beauty of this land? Can any well-born Canadian see it and fail to feel his pulse quicken? I invite you, my dear compatriots of Toronto, to come and see our Charlevoix Mountains, where I was born; our wonderful Gaspé, with its green waves and its lusty fishermen; our citadel of Quebec; our great St. Lawrence River; our Saguenay; our Lake St. John; our Laurentians. I invite you especially to spend some time in our countryside chatting with our farmers—good, simple, honest, hospitable folk, full of common sense, gifted with picturesque speech. You would have only to know them to love them. You would soon see a great increase in sympathy between two great groups made to understand and to like each other.

It is pretty late and my speech must have an end. I could say much more about Canadian unity but I hope that the work will be continued and we will see more and more French-Canadians coming to Ontario and all the provinces, and more and more Ontario people coming to the Province of Quebec, learning French and talking French to our people. It is very hard for the ordinary people to love a population, or to love an individual rather, that they do not understand, and the more you have individuals able to speak with one another and understand one another, the more we will have friendship and Canadian unity, create a great and powerful nation and help to perfect the civilization of the North American continent. (Applause)

The President: Monsieur Harvey, I am sure I voice the sentiments of all in this room, as well as those who have listened to you over the air, when I say The Empire Club of Canada stands foursquare behind the idea of Canadian provincial unity. Many of those in this room have had the privilege at some time of living in the Province of Quebec; many others have had the privilege of travelling back and forth to the City of Montreal, St. Hyacinthe, Sherbrooke, Quebec and many other cities in the Province of Quebec, and they will join with me in saying a warm welcome awaits any resident of the Province of Ontario who has the time and means to spend some portion of the year in your Province.

On behalf of The Empire Club, I extend to you, Sir, its warmest thanks. (Applause)

The meeting is adjourned.

"SPAIN—ITS INTERNAL ISSUES AND REPERCUSSIONS AS AFFECTING THE BRITISH EMPIRE"

AN ADDRESS BY

LIEUT-COLONEL J. R. J. MACNAMARA, M.P.

Chairman: The President—Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, January 26, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Recently an invitation was extended by a group in the United States to a young British Parliamentarian to come to the United States and deliver a series of talks. It is because of that that we have the privilege today of welcoming one of the youngest members of the British Parliament, Lieutenant-Colonel J. R. J. MacNamara. The Colonel is young in years but not in experience. Already he has drawn considerable attention from the English press and from his colleagues, because of his straightforward views and fearlessness in expressing them. He is a Member of the Conservative Party, but nevertheless he has not hesitated to oppose its policies when his principles were at variance with them. The Colonel was born in India, educated in Britain, and has travelled in practically every part of Asia and Europe. He tells me, however, this is his first visit to Canada, but promises to come back in the summer if his parliamentary duties will permit.

Colonel MacNamara has selected as his subject: "Spain—Its Internal Issues and Repercussions as Affecting the British Empire." This is a subject with which he is well qualified to deal, because he has spent some time in Spain and has conversed with the leaders there. But there is another side to Colonel MacNamara and I feel this should be mentioned especially. He was the leader in the movement to transport Basque refugee children, regardless of race or creed, to a safe haven in Great Britain. (Applause.)

I have great pleasure in asking Lieutenant-Colonel

MacNamara to address our Members. Colonel MacNamara. (Applause.)

Colonel J. R. J. MacNamara: Mr. President and Gentlemen: You have today asked me to speak to you on "Spain." I deeply appreciate the honour which you have conferred upon me by asking me to your luncheon as your guest today. At the same time I do feel somewhat hesitant in speaking on this very thorny subject. I realize how much the Spanish issue, both internal and external, has affected the whole world. I realize how sometimes even people who are perfectly normal individuals in their own life are unable always to keep their tempers with the best of friends when the Spanish issue is mentioned. So, because I intend to talk frankly and I don't see any point in speaking unless I speak frankly, I hope at the start that I shall not offend anyone's susceptibilities.

Now, the world, as I said, has been deeply affected by the Spanish struggle, but the roots of the cause of this Spanish struggle go right back into medieval history. They can be traced a long way and now we are watching the spectacle of an old Spain turning into a modern state, going through hundreds of years of history in the course of one man's lifetime, and not only one man's lifetime but merely a few years of that one man's lifetime. If one understands that at the start one understands a great deal of what is happening in that Iberian Peninsula.

As long ago as 1837 we heard of convents being burned, of priests being attacked, of all the same symptoms which characterize the conflict of today. There is nothing new in it. Before now monarchs have been booted out of Spain, only to return the honoured guests of the very people who kicked them out. Before now they have had Republican elements and have turned again to the system of King at the top and Government below, and so on. We have heard of "Red" dangers long before Communism or Bolshevism were known in Russia. The anarchy of Barcelona was known, as I say, long before the Bolshevism of Russia. Anarchy is an old creed, not actually what some people think it to be. Some people look upon the stage anarchist as a man wrapped in a long black cloak, with a large hat pulled tight over the eyes, a man who moves stealthily by night, a sinister figure. My own opinion is the anarchist is nothing like that. On the contrary, he is more a Puritan. He is something like Oliver Cromwell's Roundheads of Britain. They are mystic in a way and severely religious for their own anarchical doctrines and they are not always anti-religious, as we know it, either. In fact, at one large anarchist procession in Southern Spain, just before the Civil War, they took along in the procession of the anarchists a statue of the Virgin Mary, because they said (I don't know why) they thought that she was just as good an anarchist as themselves.

In Spain all during the last century the Spaniards looked upon all government as a necessary evil, but they never considered that any government really mattered until 1898 when they lost a war against the United States, a war over Cuba, and after that they began to realize, after all, governments did matter. They never got a really good government and so all the time they have been consistently hostile to any government that has been in power.

Very little social legislation was passed by any government until the time of Primo de Rivera, and very little was done for the people, but still the government continued in office with a great deal of political bribery and that sort of game going on all the time. The trouble came to a head about the year 1921, when the Spaniards suffered a terrible disaster in Morocco. Their forces were fighting against the Moors, who had a leader called Abd-el-Krim, and they were defeated and practically annihilated at a battle in which 10,000 Spaniards were killed by the Moors, and, what is worse, about 4,000 were taken prisoners by the Moors. Since the time of that terrible defeat there has been no stability in Spain. The King was personally held responsible by the Spanish people for this defeat and so the Spaniards turned against their monarchy and they turned against every government which was supporting the monarchy.

When Primo de Rivera came into power in 1923 he found a Spain which had nearly disintegrated already. He tried to pull the country together. He tried to put life again into the people who were all politically cutting each other's throats. He found a state of affairs which was very difficult even for a dictator like himself to deal with. Poverty among the people was very widespread. It had been impossible to tackle the land question. The peasants didn't own land. They were mostly out of work at certain seasons of the year and there was no way of providing them with relief and meals were very few and far between. In the army there was one officer for every five or six men and at least one General for every day of the year, but no equipment, no guns, no ammunition. He tried his best to put that state of affairs right, but he failed. He failed because of the intrigues of people around him, and he failed because of his own waning health and, because he failed, the King, who had supported him, failed too.

So Spain not only lost her last hope in Primo de Rivera, but she lost also the last stabilizing background in the monarchy. The King left Spain and various other forms of government were tried. They tried Republican Government, and government, first of all, mildly left wing, then mildly right wing. Then there was a general election when both sides formed Fronts, and the Popular Front got in by a small majority. That was the government just prior to the civil war. It was a weak government. It was a government which adopted a policy of wait and hope for the best, but nothing more, and meanwhile other forces got to work inside Spain and helped in this work of disintegration. There were Communists on the one hand; there were Nazi elements and Fascist elements, particularly Nazi elements, on the other, and there were in between those, strong anarchists who sought to make trouble in any way they possibly could.

So all these forces got to work and Spain began to split up. The outbreak of revolution was only a matter of time. Already there was chaos within the country. Murders were being committed—it was gang warfare—and the police themselves were just as bad when they retaliated. There were told stories, which I am sorry to say were often true, about torture by the police in prison and so on.

Well, that was a good ground for amateur revolutionaries from the world over to come in and sow their seed and they did so. Then there came a murder on both sides, about July of 1936, and that prompted the military revolt. There was a revolt by the army on the one hand and in towns and villages where there wasn't a revolt by the army on the one hand, there was immediately a revolution by the workers on the other hand. So you had the military revolt started, and which was successful in some places, but in other places there was a revolution. The only difference, really, between the two, was that where the military revolted they formed entirely new governments. They formed committees, those military juntas which took charge of the town or district where they had been successful; whereas on the revolutionist side, the revolutionaries, though they formed committees or juntas, too, and ruled themselves, still did so in the name of the government of the day.

So now we found a Spain which was in a state of civil war, a state of chaos, a country which was being torn internally and externally with matters with which we need not concern ourselves, but a country which stands in a strategic part of the world, a country which, when there is trouble within it, is an ideal place for other countries to interfere in for their own purposes—purposes quite unrelated to the Spanish internal issue, and that is what has happened.

Before the outbreak of hostilities there was intrigue going on inside Spain. When hostilities broke out, immediately we heard of Italian aeroplanes fighting for General Franco. It may be that those Italian aeroplanes were there before the outbreak of the civil war. It may be that they arrived coincident with the civil war, but that is only relative. Since then there has been intervention by many European powers for their own satisfaction and their own satisfaction alone. At least that is how I read it. I was told in Britain in the same way as all other Britons were told by the Italians, that they had come to Spain to fight Bolshevism for the sake of the rest of Europe. I was amazed to find the Italians so generous on behalf of Britain and the rest of Europe. I was told that the Germans, who were persecuting their own Christians in Germany at the time, had come to join hands with the Mahomedan Moors in defence of Christianity. Again, I was amazed at the generosity of the Germans.

On the other side there has undoubtedly been help given to the Spanish Government by Russia and by other countries to a certain extent, too. But if we are going to be fair now we must confess that the scale of help has been entirely weighted in favour of one side. The Russians sent arms and ammunition to governmental Spain. They sent also a few technicians. It may have been that arms and ammunition and a few technicians found their way into governmental Spain from other countries as well, but the other side, General Franco's side, has had the organized troops, the organized regiments, the fighting regiments of Italy, plus their arms and their ammunition, and their aeroplanes, and besides, German arms, ammunition and aeroplanes and German technicians helping them, and if General Franco wins in Spain today it will be a foreign victory, and not a purely Spanish victory.

I went to Spain myself soon after the outbreak of the war to see what was happening, because I found in Britain that it was very hard to get the truth. People were taking one side or the other and they were violently prejudiced and it was very difficult to get anyone to give a fair account of what was happening. I flew to Barcelona and went on by train and then by car into Madrid, creeping into Madrid without any lights during a bombardment overnight. It was very interesting in Madrid, in the war zone. About one third of the whole city had been destroyed. There was a huge refugee problem. Refugees were filling all the basements of public buildings. They were living in the hotels—wherever there was room. They were living in the underground stations, and they were lying along the streets on a cold winter's night in bitter Madrid, and they were being bombed and harassed with shell fire. There was a great shortage of food. One would see the women lining up in queues for food, waiting perhaps ten hours for the sake of getting ultimately, perhaps, one cauliflower, which would cost them a dollar, and on that they would have to feed, or try to feed their whole family.

At the edge of the city ran the front line and I went there many times and saw the soldiers, the battalions, marching up in the morning, carrying nothing but umbrellas, and taking over the rifles, such as they were, of the troops in the trenches, and the troops leaving were taking away, not rifles but the umbrellas of the people who came up. That was the way they were trying to carry on. The bombing went on day and night, and also the shelling, but I would like to tell this audience, if anybody thinks they are going to subdue a civilian population or country by bombing a civilian population, in my opinion, they are entirely wrong. I saw that myself in Madrid. I saw the bombers come over and I should say the government enlistment figures went up tenfold every time there was an aerial raid. I remember seeing a bomb drop on a house and kill eight people, four women and four children. The old lady of the house, the grey-haired grandmother was still alive. She was let out of a top window, covered with blood and white plaster from the walls. She was let out in the street and she stood there, supported by people on either side, looking up at all that was hers, completely destroyed by one bomb. What was her reaction? It wasn't to open the gates of Madrid to the invaders, the persons who had done the bombing. On the contrary, when a young fifteen-year-old grandson ran up the street to her and took her hand, she turned to him and said, "My boy, so far I have forbidden you to go and fight because you are too young, but now you may go and enlist." That, Gentlemen, in my opinion, is what will happen in other cities if a foreign invader should start bombing civilian populations.

Now the war has run on, and the weight of material, and so the fortunes, have been in General Franco's favour. He has slowly fought his way through government defences, winning bit by bit in the various theatres, and it now looks as though he were going to clear up that pocket in Catalonia, although I would hate to be too sure, because Spain is still a country of surprises. I would like to mention that, in my opinion, still the most effective weapon of the battlefield, so we have learned in the Spanish War, is the heavy gun. People make a lot of fuss nowadays about the bombing aeroplane, but I do not personally believe it to be nearly as effective as some people would make out. Of course it has its uses in war, but what has gained General Franco his victories, time and again, has been not so much the bombing aeroplanes, but his superior weight of artillery. He has immense power in his artillery to battle his way through fortifications, however well prepared and however well planned. In defence, I think that the machine gun has proved once again to be a most effective weapon. Although the government side has been ill equipped and has not had the proper weapons for fighting a major war, it has had a certain amount of machine guns, and, where the defence has been successful, once again it has been successful where there has been a network of machine guns served by just a few men. They have been able to hold up advances time and again for very long periods.

As I say, the war may now possibly be drawing to a close in the northern sector. That does not mean that the Spanish War will necessarily come to an end, but it does, of course, make us think once again of how much we may be affected by this foreign intervention in what we had hoped originally would be a purely Spanish struggle.

In my opinion, Germany has intervened in Spain because of a short term policy in Spain itself; whereas Italy has intervened in Spain because of a long term policy. Germany, in my opinion, sent her weapons and her men to Spain because she wanted to have aeroplanes and troops south of the French Pyrenees frontier, with all that that means to France, during the critical times when she was going to march into Austria and Czecho-Slovakia in central Europe. She wanted also and has got, the iron ore in that northwestern part of Spain to help her in her own rearmament programme. I do not think it likely that the Germans would want to stay in Spain permanently, although they might wish to have the use of certain ports as submarine bases for their navy in the Spanish Peninsula. The Italians, on the other hand, I feel have a long term policy in Spain. It is Mussolini's avowed policy to recreate the Roman Empire, and in order to do so he talks of the Mediterranean as being an Italian lake. He has already fought a war in Abyssinia, in order to gain control of that end of the Red Sea and, therefore, the Mediterranean. He is now making claims for Tunis, Corsica, and Nice, and in order to complete the picture he must also have control at the western end of the Mediterranean. He would like, I think, permanently to have stationed in Spanish ports, submarines or aircraft which would make it very difficult for Britain, with her trade routes through the Mediterranean. He already has control of two of the Balearic Islands, and I think it is rather doubtful that the Italians will give up that control lightly, even though the war may cease. The control of those Balearic Islands is of vital importance to France because France has to bring troops across from Africa to her mainland in order to augment her metropolitan army. Likewise if territory in Africa is threatened she must bring across troops, and those Balearic Islands threaten her routes in the same way that our trade routes through the Mediterranean are now threatened by the Italians in various other places. So you can see the Mediterranean has been made unsafe already, and, if the Italians are successful in Spain and still continue to be hostile to us, the Mediterranean will be made a sea which will be very uncertain, to put it mildly, for the British and French mercantile marine and naval vessels of war. That is a very serious matter, Gentlemen, for both the French and the British Empires.

It is true that we, in Britain, have an alternative route to the East, via the Cape. We can go around the Cape of Good Hope to India, Australia and New Zealand. That is true. But do not forget that there are also Spanish colonies on the West African Coast—Rio de Oro, Rio Muni, and the Island of Fernando Po—and if those Spanish colonies were to be hostile to Brtiain because Spain became a hostile power to Britain under her new masters, or if those colonies should fall into the hands of another power, another European power who wished to cut off our route to the East, via the Cape as well as through the Mediterranean, then you can see that it is going to be very difficult for Britain to keep open Empire communications with South Africa, with India, with Australia, and with New Zealand.

All this, Gentlemen, in my opinion, is part of a carefully worked out plan, a carefully worked out plan of the Rome-Berlin-Tokio triangle. You see those three powers working together and co-ordinating every move. Whenever one makes a move, such as a march into Austria, the other creates a diversion elsewhere. Just before Herr Hitler's march into Austria, the Japanese pretended to be angry with the French over the alleged passing of arms from French Indo-China into China, and they were making an incident with the French and keeping the French quiet in the Far East over that. Two days before Herr Hitler marched into Austria, General Franco started his big offensive in the Aragon, and that was enough, with the trouble in the Far East, to keep the French completely quiet in Europe. Every single move is co-ordinated.

That is why I say we are going through now another world war. We may not actually be fighting at the moment ourselves, but there is and there has been, since July, 1936, when we first saw foreign intervention in

Spain, a new world war in progress, a world war which is being fought on an entirely new technique, a new type of world power politics, backed up, if necessary, by military force, backed up, if necessary, by open hostilities, a kind of war which may be very inclusive one day if it is allowed to continue and grow and spread, a kind of war which I say we have not yet fully understood, a kind of war which, in my opinion, is far more dangerous to people like ourselves, Britons who live all over the world, than any other kind of war which we as a race have ever had to face in the past. It is difficult, of course, for us in Britain now, at this moment, to see what we can do in the Spanish issue. It is difficult for us to do anything material, either way. At the same time we are beginning in Britain now to wake up to the dangers of this new type of world war and that is why we have embarked upon a policy of rearmament, a policy of getting our nation prepared against any eventuality, and I assure you, Gentlemen, that whatever you may have read to the contrary, or whatever the dictators or others may have sneered about us, that there is a very determined spirit in Britain today, a spirit backed up by a shrewd instinct which knows how far it can go, and the point beyond which it cannot let others go. There is that spirit which is just as determined to look after our interests as a nation and as an Empire as any spirit that may have preceded us in generations before. (Applause.) But it is not only the spirit that is there. We are too close to realities to indulge in luxuriant theories. We have to face facts and the fact is that now we need to be materially strong and so we are building ourselves the armaments. We are violently self-critical, that is quite true. There are certain nations in the world who boast about themselves and say how wonderful they are, but underneath all that boasting, because they do not allow of any criticism, there may be, for all we know, a great deal of inefficiency. We adopt exactly the other policy. We are violently self-critical. Every single thing we do we criticize about ourselves. We allow freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of criticism, and so we are able to probe all along the line and discover if there is any inefficiency anywhere, and when we do, and when we find the inefficiency, of course it is published everywhere and thus gets into the newspapers of every nation in the world. By doing that we get it put right, which, after all, is far better than going along and telling ourselves that we are simply wonderful, but not allowing anybody to find out whether it is true that we are wonderful or not. That is just the difference between us and the others.

I will say to you, Gentlemen, that we are now getting very well prepared in our Homeland, and we are not only getting prepared in material strength, but we are getting well prepared in our manpower, too. We have a voluntary army in Britain, the Territorial Army, the same as your non-permanent militia here, or much the same as the National Guards in the United States. That Territorial Army of volunteers is now over strength. It is over strength and there is a spirit throughout the country by which we find girls nowadays even handing a white feather to young men who are not in the Territorial Army. It is over strength but we are increasing it still more

We are also calling upon people in factories, people that we cannot spare to go and fight in war, to train themselves to defend their factories against aerial attack. They work in factories, but, if an air raid warning should sound, they have their own guns in the factories and can run out, dropping their work and taking up their arms in a few moments.

We have our balloon air barrages, our anti-aircraft artillery, our expeditionary force, ready to go abroad, if necessary.

One way and another we are getting prepared and it means, because we don't want to spend too much money on it, by only having people do it full time, that we are calling upon the voluntary services of the country. The people who give their time voluntarily now have to give a great deal of time in order to make themselves efficient. Night after night you see them in the Territorial drill halls. Night after night they are going to Air Raid Precaution meetings, or whatever it may be, but one way and another, I say my Homeland, Britain, has wakened up to the fact that we are going through anxious years and it has wakened up to the necessity of being completely and absolutely prepared against any eventuality.

I say that because I hope it may be, perhaps, a word of comfort in this country, where one is apt to see the exaggerated reports, on the other hand, of inefficiencies, which are found out as a result of free criticism. We are, I think, very strong at the moment, very strong indeed, and I think that any power in the world that underestimates our strength now, might learn for themselves a sorry lesson. (Applause.) Not only do we wish to be strong ourselves but we see strength, as well, in unity. We see great strength in the unity of all peoples who are looking in the same direction as ourselves and who think the same thoughts in the similar way to ourselves. We want to see those of us in the world who have common interests become more united than ever and that is why, Gentlemen, I am so delighted, as well as honoured, to have had the opportunity to speak this afternoon to a Club like yours, The Empire Club of Canada, a Club where I have seen a generous understanding and I know there is a wonderful spirit of Empire unity. It is the greatest pleasure to me, as a British Member of Parliament, to come here to your country and to lunch among friends like you, who have the same feelings as myself. We do realize, all of us, I know, that we are going through difficult times in the future, and when one goes through difficult times there is nothing better in the world than to have true friends.

(Loud Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel MacNamara, I think after the demonstration which you have just witnessed, you realize you spoke true words when you said that The Empire Club of Canada is truly British. On behalf of that Club may I express to you, Sir, our warmest thanks, and may I ask when you go back to England that you tell those of your confreres who have addressed us, and those who have not addressed us, that we welcome, most gladly welcome, an opportunity of introducing and having speak to us a Member of the Mother of Parliaments. I thank you again most warmly, on behalf of the Club.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause.)

"CANADA AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE"

AN ADDRESS BY CAPTAIN R. G. CAVELL

Chairman—The President, J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.

Thursday, February 2, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club, I feel that the Club is fortunate in having secured as its speaker today, Captain Cavell, who will speak to us on a subject which is of interest not only today but every day during the weeks and months, so long as we remain a part of the British Empire which, please God, will be forever. The subject is "Canada and the British Empire."

Captain Cavell was born in England and later on in his life he went to India. He was trained in the military schools for an Army career which he had chosen as his future. He served in India for fourteen years as a cavalry officer in the Indian Army. In the Great War he served with the Indian troops in Mesopotamia. He was wounded and upon his return to India he joined the Government Service there and performed valuable service in many parts of the Indian Kingdom. Later, he travelled to Japan and to China and the nature of his work took him through all parts of Europe. About three years ago he moved to Canada which he has made his permanent home ever since, that is if a man who has travelled as much as the Captain has can have a permanent home. In 1938 he visited Europe and from his observations in Europe, in the British Dominions, in the East and in India, and now in Canada, he is going to give us his views upon the subject, "Canada and the British Empire." I have great pleasure in introducing Captain R. G. Cavell. (Applause)

CAPTAIN R. G. CAVELL: Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests and Gentlemen: You have done me a great honour in inviting me to speak to you today, and that honour I very much appreciate.

It has been my good fortune, as your Chairman has just told you, to see most, if not all, of the British Empire, and to work in many parts of it, and I am going today to try to give you some of the experiences I have gained in my travels through that Empire. I speak to you today, not so much as the Englishman I once was, but as the Canadian I am fast becoming.

I came here a few years ago, straight from the miseries and hardships caused in China by Japan's dastardly attack upon a defenceless people, and Canada seemed to me then to be a great haven of peace and refuge. Since then I have travelled from coast to coast many times and I can assure you no Canadian-born citizen loves this great country today any better than I do. Therefore, Gentlemen, I hope you will not think me presumptuous in choosing as my subject today, "Canada and the British Empire."

The year 1938 was undoubtedly the most difficult year in recent history. If 1939 continues as it has begun it promises to be an equally difficult one. So far, war has been averted, and thereby the lives of millions of men, women and children have been saved, but no one can look at Europe today without realizing that the peace which has so far been achieved is a very precarious one. This was brought very forcibly home to me when I was in Europe last year. There we find the brains of engineers and men of science engaged, not as they should be, in furthering the betterment of mankind, but in devising ever more terrible weapons for the wholesale destruction of men, women and children, and the cities in which they live, and this unproductive use of brains, labour and raw material everywhere is pulling down the living conditions of the people and lowering standards of civilization.

Now, Gentlemen, what has brought about this appalling situation? If we go back one hundred years we find the British Empire well founded, Britain's trade established and being built up, and during the hundred years we find both Empire and trade growing stronger and stronger. If we look at Germany during the same period we find a collection of disunited states. It was not until 1870 that Bismarck finally welded those states into a united Germany. This unification of German states seems to have given rise to intense nationalism, a sense of power, and a desire for conquest in German rulers. It reached its peak in 1914, when Germany set out on a war of European conquest. She was defeated, humiliated, and, as you all know, pulled down from a position of great world power and her people suffered terrible hardships. Her government changed many times and now, only twenty years after those events, the world again faces a Germany with a ruler bent on conquest, a slightly different kind of ruler, but one still imbued with the old Prussian idea that Germany must rule the world. German Prussianism was a menace to the peace of the world prior to 1914 and it is a menace today.

Similarly with Italy: a comparatively few years ago Italy was a collection of warring states, only unified about 1860 and as you all know, the rise of Japan from feudalism to a world power has happened in only the last fifty years. The comparatively recent rise of these nations, Gentlemen, it seems to me, has bred in them a fierce nationalism, responsible for the present situation and the destruction of the League of Nations.

Now, the League of Nations was not by any means a perfect organization but it was a great step along the road of mankind's progress. After the terrible slaughter and suffering of the Great War the nations of the world came together and decided that in future all their international disputes should be settled by the rule of law and not by the rule of force. The League was set up and for some years it looked as though a great era of peace and prosperity had arrived for mankind.

Then the creed of Fascism began to raise its ugly head on the Continent of Europe, preaching the doctrine of force, maintaining that man was made for the state, that man must be subordinated to the state, and his individual freedom sacrificed to a rigid control by state officials. This was a creed, Gentlemen, which was well suited to these new nationalistic nations gradually coming into being and seeking the height of their power. We find Japan with a military dictatorship waging war in China. We find Mussolini raising a black-shirted political army, under his personal control, not under the control of the then government of Italy. We find that army bludgeoning its leader into power, beating, killing and imprisoning political opponents. Then a little later we find Hitler raising a brown-shirted and Storm Troop Army, under his personal control, and the brutalities practised by that army in bludgeoning Hitler into power are among the greatest blots on the history of human conduct.

Before this creed of force, the liberties of the people of those countries have disappeared completely and the hope for peace that the League of Nations offered mankind at one time has likewise gone, until today the world is slowly but very surely dividing into two great armed camps: on the one hand, the dictatorships, on the other, the democracies; the dictatorships with their tyrannies, concentration camps, torture chambers, and their aim the glorification of the state at the expense of the freedom and well-being of the people: the democracies, with their freedom of speech and action for all within their borders and their aim, the greatest good to the greatest number within a framework of law and liberty.

Now we find this creed of force, which put the dictators into power, being introduced into international politics. First, the Japanese army, then Mussolini, then Hitler, putting their pistols to the heads of the great democracies and making demand after demand under the threat of force, and this continual series of threats is giving rise to the greatest piling up of armaments which has ever been known in history.

This introduction of force into world affairs has been a very great blow to the democratic nations. As I said just now, they were prepared for an era of peace and law. No longer can the democracies look forward to that era. No longer can the democracies afford to be unarmed, and just as democratic freedom was established by men dying or being prepared to die to bring it into being, so today must the people of the democracies be prepared to make great sacrifices in its defense. There is much, Gentlemen, that we can and that we must do to defend this democracy which we all enjoy today. One of the most important things which we must do is to co-operate, and in this country we are in a most excellent position for co-operation because we are already a member state in the greatest Commonwealth of Democratic States; the British Empire. There has never been a time in the history of the Empire when lack of unity among its member states would have been so disastrous as it would today. A united British Commonwealth of Nations, fully armed and co-operating to the full with the other great democracies of the world is the best safeguard for peace that we can have, so long as the dictators continue, as they are continuing, to put their pistols to our heads.

Now, Gentlemen, in view of the importance of a solid and united Empire in these difficult times, it might be helpful today if we considered this Empire in some detail and examined some of the difficulties which beset it. The land surface of the earth is, roughly, 52,500,000 square miles, and the land surface of the British Empire is, roughly, 12,000,000 square miles, so that roughly the British Empire comprises one quarter of the land surface of the world. The total population of the world is, in round figures, 1,900,000,000; the total population of the British Empire is, roughly, 67,000,000 whites and 404,000,000 blacks, and when I say "blacks" I include all coloured people. This gives us a British Empire total of 471,000,000 people. That, Gentlemen, is, very roughly, one quarter of the population of the world.

Now, as you know the constant cry of the dictators is that the British Empire has too much territory, but if any of you know a fairer arrangement than that, whereby one quarter of the world's population occupies one quarter of the land surface of the earth, I should like to know what it is!

Now, with a view to a better understanding of the Empire in general and its difficulties in particular, let us start on a quick tour, starting in England. As I said just now, the great democracies, including England, have very recently realized that the peace and security for which they hoped is in great jeopardy and England is in process of turning herself from a League of Nations country, organized for peace, into a country organized for war. Unfortunately, Gentlemen, democracy moves slowly; it must of necessity move slowly if it is to remain democratic. Personally, I have no patience with those people who grumble because democracy does not move as fast as dictatorship. Democracies rest in the last analysis on the will of a free voting people and you can only ascertain the will of a people slowly. Meanwhile, England rearms and again sets herself up on a war basis, and Mr. Chamberlain does the best he can to keep peace in Europe until such a time as England fully recovers her armament status. His critics say he is too eager in this direction, but can a man in his position be too eager for peace? However that may be, I hope and think we shall soon see a change. In fact, I think the change is already discernible and I feel we can soon look forward to the day when England will say to the dictators, "Wait for England's answer until she is ready to give it."

Meanwhile, in England as in other democratic countries, the dictators are menacing democracy. They menace it in many ways, to give only one example, their continual threats of force are likely to drive England into conscription which, after all, is an undemocratic mode of recruiting an army. Unless this constant threat is checked the whole of democracy throughout the world will be seriously jeopardized, and most of our cherished democratic institutions will be no more, ruthless regimentation will take their place.

It seems to me, Gentlemen, that Mr. Chamberlain thoroughly understands, what I was saying just now, that these nations with whom he is dealing on the Continent of Europe are new nations that have very recently, comparatively speaking, arrived at the positions they occupy today, and like all newly arrived people they are very touchy and very sensitive. You only have to think for a moment of that stupid protest Germany made recently about something the Mayor of New York said. Can you imagine England or Canada making an official protest because a Mayor somewhere in the world said something disagreeable? These nations, Gentlemen, are very new and very touchy. It seems to me Mr. Chamberlain is trying to say, time and again, "Come down off your high horse, come into the comity of nations with us. Come down and see if we can't settle these problems that, after all, are as much ours as yours, but if you refuse, take the consequences."

And now, leaving England and sailing down the coast of Spain, we come to Gibraltar, that fortress which has become of such vital importance to the British Empire in the last few years, owing to war in Spain, and Italy's ambitions in the Mediterranean. The last time I sailed into Gibraltar Harbour about six o'clock one morning a large part of the Mediterranean fleet was lying there at anchor, and I have never before or since realized the might and power of our great Empire as I did at that moment, with that mighty fleet in front of me, and behind me the rock with its powerful fort.

Then, passing into the Mediterranean, along the north coast of Africa, we come to that territory which has caused the British Government such an enormous amount of trouble over the last few years. That trouble has been very largely caused by the huge broadcasting stations which have been erected there by the dictator nations, and constantly vilify the British Empire in Arabic, broadcasting daily anything likely to put a wrong construction on Britain's intentions and doing all they can to lower our prestige in that part of the world, and Britain, with her dear old muddling ways, set out to counteract that propaganda and I actually heard, when once there, the most beautiful broadcast over a British station, given to the Arabs in the most faultless Oxford English! That, I believe, has now been corrected and, like the dictators, we are now broadcasting counter propaganda to the Arabs in Arabic.

At the eastern end of the Mediterranean we come to Palestine, another very troublesome spot in the Empire today. The position in Palestine is one of the most serious which faces the Empire today anywhere in the world. Very briefly, I will try to tell you what the trouble is all about. Many years ago the Arabs, as you know, were a very great nation. Much of the culture we have today came from the old Empire of Arabia, but like most great Empires it fell into decay and is no longer the great force it once was in the world. About twenty years ago the Arabs started a movement for the reconstruction of their Empire, and just as that movement was beginning to gain momentum, the Balfour Declaration was made and Palestine, which the Arabs hoped would be one of the principal states in the new Arab Empire, was thrown open for Jewish colonization, and the Arabs began to agitate and to do what they could to stop the influx of Jews into what they considered one of their most important states. Now, the Arabs have no objection to the Jews as such. There are at the present moment about a million Jews living in various parts of Arabia and living very happily. What the Arabs object to is the Zionist movement which claims Palestine as a Jewish country to be controlled by the Jewish people which conflicts with the Arab idea of another Arab Empire. The Jews, on the other hand, have done marvellous work in Palestine. I was over much of it a few years ago. They have planted orange groves and put in a lot of work on various other agricultural projects. They have started small factories and they have done a very fine colonizing job in Palestine. We can only hope that the conference now going on in London will find some way whereby the Arabs and Jews can live peaceably in Palestine and both prosper.

Then, passing on down through Africa, we come to Kenya Colony, a colony which is undoubtedly going to be heard of in the near future, a colony which, unlike Canada, has too little transportation, a colony which can grow the finest cattle that can be grown anywhere in the Empire on grass alone. They need no grain, but they cost so much to get to the coast that it is almost impossible to market them, and that is one of the great problems with all the products of Kenya Colony at the moment. Tanganyika and Rhodesia are being developed by British capital and some of our finest reserves of raw material are there.

So we come at last to South Africa. Very naturally, South Africa, today, Gentlemen, is very concerned with the question of the German colonies. Some of the territory which was formerly German, as you will see if you look on your maps, is very unpleasantly close to South Africa. Coupling this fact with the fact that South Africa today has a small German minority, you will see they have just cause for their apprehension.

South Africa has also two internal major problems. One, the problem of the poor white; the other, that of the native black man in South Africa. The poor white problem arises in this way: the original settlers had a very peculiar inheritance law which said that when a man died his farm and possessions must be divided equally among his descendants. They had many sons, some ten or twelve, and the first time a big farm was divided into twelve, of course it lowered its potential earning power. The second time those twelve parts were again divided into ten or twelve they became small holdings, and now much of the land that formerly belonged to the old Boers in that way has disappeared and many have become poor whites and the problem of the South African Government is how to maintain the prestige of a poor white in Africa when he can only do labour that is much better done by the black man. That is a problem which I am afraid will occupy the South African Government for a long time to come, meanwhile the poor white gets poorer and poorer.

Then, there is also the problem of the native black. As you know, it is progressively the policy of the British Empire to educate its native sons and as they become prepared for it to give them self-government, gradually and safely, but in this case we have in South Africa an element, the Boers, which is imbued with the idea that the black man was born to be the white man's slave and it opposes any education of the natives and any betterment of his lot. So there you have another problem, and a constant conflict in South Africa between the British element and the Boer element in the Government, the one wanting to better the lot of the black man and the other wanting to keep him down, which is not in accordance with British policy. I predict, unless something is done to settle this problem within the next ten or twenty years, that there will be a native problem in South Africa, as acute as the native problem has been in India for many years past.

Now, Gentlemen, we come to that country in the Empire which I perhaps know better than any of them, and that is India. India certainly still constitutes one of the greatest problems which faces the Empire anywhere in the world. Today, I want you to consider a country roughly half the size of Canada, with 350,000,000 people, divided into Hindoos, Mohammedans, Sikhs, Jains, Animists, Parsees, and many, many other castes and sub castes, not welded together into an autonomous whole but divided, bitterly divided, by religious strife and intolerance into factions which continually fight each other as our daily papers so frequently report. Particularly the Mohammedans and the Hindoos have unique and age-old ways of annoying one another. It goes something like this: Let us say the Hindoos are having a festival. They drag out their gods and go along the streets in procession. The cow, as you know, is a sacred animal to Hinduism. So the Mohammedans slaughter a cow and as the procession is getting under way they throw a piece of beef into the procession. That defiles the priests, defiles the gods, and raises general havoc. The Hindoos get very angry, go home and get their big sticks and beat up every Mohammedan they can find.

But that, Gentlemen, that is only the beginning of the story. In a very few weeks the Mohammedans have a festival, and, as you know, the pig is unclean to Mohammedans. So the Hindoos slaughter a pig and as the Mohammedans are offering prayers in the mosque, the Hindoos hurl over the wall a piece of pork. That again upsets everything and defiles the mosque and priests. The Mohammedans get very angry, they rush home and they get their big sticks and beat up every Hindoo they can lay hands on.

That is only one of the causes of those religious riots so often mentioned in our newspapers and all too often reporting serious loss of life. In addition to these religious difficulties, the people of India speak some 220 different languages, and I am sure you will all agree with me that it is a very difficult job for the British Government to work out a Home Rule Bill which will be fair to all these factions. To my mind, the road to self-government for India is going to be a very long one, but it is now definitely on the way.

In the meantime, I say, without fear of contradiction, that the British have done more for India in the last hundred years than had been done previously in thousands. Take only two factors, the great irrigation schemes and railways. Those two together have eliminated one of the greatest scourges throughout the ages, the scourge of famine, and no one today dies in India from famine, whereas, in times past, millions have died during famines.

Leaving India and its great problem, we pass on to Singapore. There again, Gentlemen, we have one of the links in the British chain of fortifications which has become of the utmost importance in the last few years, owing to the aggression and warlike actions of Japan. When I was last in Singapore it was very obvious that we were strengthening our fortifications there to an enormous extent, but the Japanese meanwhile have not been asleep and, as you have seen from the newspapers, there has been over the last few years considerable unrest in Siam, just about 700 miles north, and that unrest is very largely caused by an influence Japan is trying to obtain in the internal affairs of Siam. If she can ever attain real control over the affairs of Siam, there is very little doubt that she will drive a canal through the Isthmus of Kra, which is only about fifty miles wide in some places. If Japan ever succeeds in doing that her fleet and merchant vessels can pass 700 miles north of Singapore into the Bay of Bengal to the north and the Indian Ocean to the south, and the Japanese fleet can go west without passing Singapore at all

Leaving Singapore and continuing our journey east, we come to Hong Kong. That great fortress in the chain of British fortifications is one which was handed over to us by the Chinese with their tongues in their cheeks, saying to themselves, "There is a great rock sticking out of the sea and there is nothing very much the British can do with that." Today not only is it one of the strongest fortresses in the world, but it is one of the most beautiful residential places in the British Empire. It has a most marvellous bay for shipping and some of the finest bathing to be found anywhere in the Empire and, of course, its real object in the chain of British fortifications is the protection of our trade with China. Today, with the Japanese controlling Canton, with the Japanese navy in the sea outside Hong Kong, the problem which faces us there is indeed a very real one, because until something can be done to make some arrangement with Japan, whereby we can trade again in Canton, the trade of Hong Kong is practically shut down. So, there again, we have a great problem facing the Empire in that southern part of China.

Then, passing on to Australia and New Zealand, we face yet another problem of Empire. By their very geographical location, Australia and New Zealand are irrevocably a part of the Pacific problem. Japan has said, time and time again, that she intends to control the Pacific, and that statement cannot but cause the greatest apprehension in New Zealand and Australia. Yet it is very difficult to see what either of these countries can do about it. New Zealand has a population of 1,500,000; Australia, a population of 6,000,000. Neither of those countries can increase that population to any very great extent. Australia cannot increase it because the centre of Australia is a great desert and they can only farm a belt around the coast of the country. Therefore, she cannot carry a very much greater population than she carries today, unless she can develop a manufacturing industry and, as you all know, Gentlemen, it is very difficult to do that with the state of the world as it is today. With the increasing unrest in the Far East, therefore, with Japan on the warpath as she is, Australia and New Zealand are a part of the Empire which must be very carefully watched and provided for in any scheme of general Empire defence.

And now, Gentlemen, last but not least, I come to this great country of Canada. This country which, it seems to me, has such a great future, this country which has the highest standard of general living conditions of any country in the world today; this country which has such wonderful natural resources, which has such a free and happy people and so much which is so well worth while preserving; this country which has nothing more worth while preserving than the freedom of its people, which many a Canadian came here to found when Canada belonged to the Indians, and which many of your ancestors gave their lives to develop to the state which it has now reached.

Unfortunately, another war in Europe is a possibility with which we must all reckon. Such a war will have very terrible consequences to the civilization of Europe. Even now, without it, the civilization of Europe seems to me to be going backward and not forward. You only have to think of the terrible pogroms against the Jews going on all over Europe to realize that fact. It seemed to me while I was in Europe last year, and more so since I have come back and thought the matter over, that the future of civilization lies on this Continent, rather than in Europe, for some years to come, at least. As you all know, there are those who visualize Canada as the future headquarters of the British Empire but however that might be, Gentlemen, there is no doubt that Canada is destined to play a very great part in the British Commonwealth of Nations, particularly if war breaks out in Europe. Actually, it seems to me that Canada has not much to fear from armed invasion, but she must be continually on guard against the insidious invasion of propaganda which is now coming in over her borders and which is constituting a very definite threat to her democracy and freedom. Such movements, Gentlemen, are undoubtedly being formed all over the American Continent and here I want to remind you, once again, that Bolshevism in Russia, Fascism in Italy, Naziism in Germany, all started as small minority movements. They climbed up the ladder of free speech and democratic privilege and then destroyed the ladder. In a democracy such as this we cannot suppress free speech, even if we do not like what is being said. Once free speech and the expression of all shades of opinion are suppressed, democracy ceases to exist, but we can and must educate our people and, particularly, our young people, against creeds which will make them slaves instead of free men.

It seems to me, Gentlemen, that you Canadians have no need to fear if you will only live up to your Constitution. The more I read the British North America Act, the more do I marvel at the wisdom of your Fathers of Confederation, they were wise and far-seeing men, particularly in the way in which they dealt with that very terrible thing, Power. They gave some to the Dominion Government, some to the Provincial Governments, some to the cities, some to the villages, some to the school boards and so on down, and in the last analysis, this wise distribution of power rests on the free Canadian, with his free vote. Where difficulties have arisen in Canada it seems to me, Gentlemen, that they have arisen more by the abuse of your magnificent Constitution than by the use of it. (Applause.) At all costs this Constitution must be preserved. The rights of the people must be maintained. Lest you think this warning unnecessary, remember the fate today of those people in Europe who, in the last few years, have had their freedom destroyed by what started in their country, as I said just now, as small minority movements. It is the concern of every Canadian, it seems to me, to see that his friends and children understand the real meaning of democracy. We must make those Canadians now growing up alive to democracy as a creed, we must make them understand what it means, we must make them realize that it is the best way of life mankind has yet devised through the ages. We must make them realize that the future of their country and of their own freedom lies in their own hands. They have the power through their vote, if they will only maintain this magnificent Constitution.

Now, Gentlemen, in conclusion I want to say this. You are undoubtedly citizens of the freest country on earth. If you would retain that freedom see that all governments you set up remain always your servants and never become your masters. (Applause) See that no politician, no matter what his creed, ever sets up a private political army, no matter what coloured shirt he wants to put on it. Canada needs only one army, that controlled by the Dominion Government. See that Canada remains a member state in the great Commonwealth of British Nations, and that by her adherence to the principles of freedom and democracy she helps to make those creeds such great forces in the world, and of such strength, that they can resist those who are trying to destroy freedom in the world today.

And, lastly, Gentlemen, I say to you, that only by eternal and constant vigilance will you Canadians retain this immortal freedom which is yours today. Only if you watch now will your children enjoy the great tomorrow which stretches out before this wonderful country. Let every Canadian really mean it when he stands up and sings, "O, Canada, we stand on guard for thee." (Loud applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Cavell, only by means of the radio is it possible to make a tour of the British Empire in such a short space of time as you have made that tour today. In doing so you have made many remarks which have been not only interesting and instructive, but also enlightening. As for your audience, composed of members of The Empire Club, each member subscribes to the motto of the Club, "Canada and a United Empire," and the great British Empire and the Dominion of Canada will ever enjoy the loyal support of our members. On behalf of the Club, I extend to you a very warm "Thank you." (Applause)

The meeting is adjourned.

"THE REICH AND THE GERMAN MINORITIES"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. KLAUS MANN

Chairman—Dr. F. A. Gaby

Thursday, February 9, 1939.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: It is my privilege today to introduce to you an outstanding literary man, the son of the famous writer, Thomas Mann. Klaus Mann is equally brilliant in his chosen career, and at an early age published several plays and several novels, among which was "The Symphonie Pathétique," which was published in London in 1937. At the present time he is writing another book and I understand it will be published shortly, which he is calling "The Escape to Life," dealing with the refugees of the various countries in Europe.

When still under twenty, Mr. Mann lectured to German students in American Universities on the life and cultural progress of the day. However, his more important contributions are in the field of literature and journalism on the present German situation. In 1933 he took up residence in Amsterdam, a voluntary exile from the Third Reich, and up to this time he has been editing in that city the publication, "Die Sammlung," which voices the culture and art of the German exiles.

Mr. Mann is eminently qualified to deal with the subject of "The Reich and the German Minorities," through his intimate knowledge, close study and understanding of the political and social problems in Germany, having been born and having lived there the greater part of his life. I understand that in the future he intends to make his home in the United States and we no doubt will hear from him at other times. I have pleasure in introducing to you today Mr. Klaus Mann. (Applause)

MR. KLAUS MANN: Gentlemen, I am not a politician, but an author. Now, one of my most successful author friends happens to be Der Fuehrer and Chancellor of the Reich at this moment. His entertaining biography, "Mein Kampf" ("My Struggle"), is much more popular in Germany than the cynical war novel. I think its circulation is even wider than that of the Holy Bible. I don't want to go into the question of whether the many millions of Germans who read Mr. Hitler's masterpiece are really voluntary, and whether all of them really enjoy their reading. To read books doesn't mean pleasure always, but to read certain books is important. It means instruction.

I am not inclined to overrate the literary qualities of Mr. Hitler's book. I think his style is quite poor. As a literary critic, I am forced to say it is quite rotten style and quite repulsive to anybody who knows anything about good German prose, but still the book is terribly important. Everybody who is interested in the future of Europe, which actually means in the future of the world, should read it. Its language, although slightly confused, is just clear enough. Without any false shame or modesty the author tells us everything about his political beliefs and convictions. More than that, he includes very significant statements concerning his political or demagogical tactics and, above all, we learn the whole truth and nothing but the truth about his political aims, his hopes, his plans, his ambitions. "Mein Kampf" really contains the Fuehrer's political programme in its entirety. Of course, it is only the complete edition of "My Struggle" you should be interested in. You couldn't get very much out of a version arranged for foreign readers. In the French edition of "Mein Kampf," for instance, the most fanatical outbursts of hatred against France are carefully omitted. What a pity for the French readers, who really should know what Hitler is actually thinking about them, and what he is preparing against them!

However, one of the main points of Hitler's policy, one of the basic principles, expressed again and again in "Mein Kampf," is the following: "All the countries where Germans are living must belong to Germany."

We would ask the question, "Well, who is really German? What is German?" Herr Hitler would answer in his brazen and impressive manner, "Everybody is a German who speaks the German language."

If everyone speaking French would be a French person and should belong to France, for this very reason the Government of France would have the moral and political duty to send troops to Belgium, to the French part of Switzerland, or into French Canada, in order to liberate this unhappy, suffering people.

All the English-speaking people, including the Americans, should belong to one country, should be one nation, and Spain should defend once more its eternal rights in South America and in Mexico.

Herr Hitler doesn't care, however, that the order of the whole world would be disturbed and ruined if other countries, other leaders would accept his dynamic principles and would imitate his dangerous tactics. What he wanted was the greater Germany. Well, he has got it. He liberated Austria and the Sudetenland. Is he satisfied with his recent successes? Not at all. He demands the still greater Germany, the greatest Germany, the Reich which would embrace part of Switzerland, Holland, Lithuania, Russia and Denmark. There are German-speaking people in all of these countries. As a matter of fact, there are German people and German-speaking people dispersed all over the world. But Hitler doesn't want merely all of them to return to their Homeland. On the contrary, he prefers to have them abroad as active agents and propagandists for Nazi ideas and Nazi power. He won't allow them, of course, to become loyal citizens of a democratic state. They have to be organized Nazis, permanently watched and controlled by the Nazi officials. I think nobody seriously can believe that Mr. Hitler really loves all his sweet little German minorities like some good old dad would like his many children. He is very able to sacrifice them and to forget all about them, if necessary.

For quite a long time we didn't hear anything about the German brothers suffering in Fascist Italy—I mean the German-speaking population living in South Tyrol, which became Italian after the war. As a matter of fact they are treated there in a much worse manner than anybody was ever treated in Czecho-Slovakia. Herr Hitler doesn't seem to be very interested any longer in the destiny of these suffering brothers, since, for the time being, he is in brilliant relations with Il Duce.

For many years the arch enemy of all German Nationalists was Poland, even though there was a lot of noise about the intolerable situation of the German minorities under the Polish Government. Matters changed, however, as Poland almost became an ally of Nazi Germany for the time being. Certainly the destiny of the German minority in Poland wasn't interesting any longer to Hitler and his friends. Of course the agitation for these minorities made it convenient to start when the moment seemed fit and favourable to the Nazis. The Nazis can wait. They demand the spontaneous outburst of the popular fury of the German people just when it is convenient to them. They are very patient. That is one fault they have got, but they never forget what they really want.

There can't be any doubt that Hitler wants the Alsace, that he wants Strasbourg. No agreement he may make with France could ever change his determined mind. He has decided to get Strasbourg, sooner or later, but he is patient. He has his agents in Alsace, as he has them everywhere. They are not supposed to make too much noise just now because Mr. Ribbentrop is flirting with Monsieur Bonnet, which does not mean that his agents have stopped their activity. He never will renounce the part of Switzerland or Holland, of Lithuania or Denmark where the population is partly German. His agents are more careful or more impertinent, depending on their instructions, and their instructions depend on the political situation of the day, but his aim is always for the good of the greatest Germany.

The whole problem of minorities is nothing really, nothing but a pretext to aid the Nazis to attack other nations. Hitler, for instance, decided to destroy, to ruin

Czecho-Slovakia, the last truly democratic country in the European East, the last faithful ally of France in the East. The suffering Germans in the Sudetenland were just a wonderful excuse for him to attack Czecho-Slovakia which seemed to him the last bulwark against the Nazi regime in the European East.

The minority slogan was nothing else but a slogan, but it was good enough to plan the shameless military intervention of Germany in Spain. Last summer, when I spent several weeks in Barcelona I interviewed some German pilots who had become prisoners of the Spanish Government. I asked these two fellows, "Well, do you really think it was a fair thing to do to bomb innocent women and children who hadn't done anything to you or to your compatriots?" Their answer was very significant. "Well," the fellows said, "we had to protect the German minorities in Spain against Bolshevism dangers." And they were sincere, they really believed it.

The German minorities. Hitler would be in quite an embarrassing situation without them. He wants to annex a country and he declares that the German minorities are suffering. "I have to liberate them." Napoleon had still to fight when he was eager to get some piece of land. Hitler is "liberating minorities," which is so much less dangerous and so much more convenient. It is questionable whether or not the German-speaking people in other countries really so very keenly desire to become citizens of the Third Reich. Do they really expect they would be happy in Nazi Germany? Well, if they do they will be bitterly disappointed. As a matter of fact, those who became German citizens during the last year are bitterly disappointed by now. In Vienna almost everybody is now deeply depressed—even people who used to be ardent Nazis under the Dollfuss-Schuschnigg era. It is now that they begin to realize what Naziism really means. Austria never belonged to the Reich. It was never part of the Reich. It would be more accurate to say that Germany, in a certain historical period, was a part of Austria when the Hapsburgs were ruling. The Austrians never liked the

Prussians very much. On the contrary, the Austrians always despised the Prussians.

Now, Vienna, the old, proud city, has become something like a little provincial German place. It is understandable that a suicide wave is going through Austria. In the horrible days and weeks following March 11, 1938, the terrible work done in Vienna was much more cool, much more thorough than the work done in the Reich. Five years of experience had shockingly improved the technique of horror, of terror. Moreover, the seizure of power in Austria in 1938 was far better prepared than in Germany in 1933 by the Nazis. There was a selected list of names and doings of all the people opposed to the Nazi regime, and it must have been horrifyingly complete. Nobody was spared, not even Frau Dollfuss, the widow of the Chancellor, and Sigmund Freud, the most distinguished citizen of Vienna, who had to go into exile.

I know the "liberated" people of the Sudetenland are going to have the same dreary experience as the Austrians. Observers who have visited this country after its annexation by Germany confirmed the fact that there isn't a great deal of enthusiasm. It is a strange and utterly significant fact that all those Sudeten Germans who left the Sudeten after annexation by Germany were forced to return, were forced to become German citizens. They would have preferred to have remained Czech citizens—yes, even to live without any passport, rather than to become subjects of Nazi Germany. It seems the Nazi authorities realize this. That is why the Nazi officials didn't allow them to decide by themselves to which country they wanted to belong. Even the Treaty of Versailles was more human, more liberal. It gave the possibility to everybody to choose his citizenship, at least. The Germans living in the Alsace or in Poland were allowed to return to Germany and to take with them everything they possessed, if they wanted to do so. Many, many thousands of German refugees from the Sudetenland, faithful Catholics, Protestants, Jews, democratic Socialists, have to face now, as German citizens, concentration camps or even death. I wouldn't even be surprised to learn that Mr. Henlein, the Nazi Fuehrer of the Sudeten is disappointed by now. His real ambition was to become something like a Fuehrer. Well, now he is nothing—just some little German official without any influence or national power. That is not exactly what he expected. Everybody has to be deeply disappointed in the long run who tries to come to good terms with the Nazis, to make friends with the Nazis by making concessions to them.

The Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, for instance, Cardinal Innitzer, hoped to save Catholicism in Austria by making friends with the Nazi regime, while his distinguished friend, the Cardinal Archbishop of Munich, condemned Nazidom with stronger expressions than ever at the meeting of the Bishops in Fulda, and while the relations between the Vatican and Berlin had reached a point which was almost an official break, the Archbishop of Vienna went so far as to give his greeting "Heil Hitler" with outstretched hands. Do you think he was successful with this kind of careful tactics? He was insulted and injured by the Nazis. He became a martyr, a victim of Nazi terror, just as was his great and distinguished colleague in Germany, Cardinal Faulhaber, and the Protestant Neimoller.

The sad case of the Austrian priest should be a serious warning to several European statesmen, who, by the way, had plenty of other warnings of this kind before them. Nobody should forget this one most important, most decisive fact. The Nazis are not fighting against certain political, religious or racial groups. They are and will always remain the deadly enemies of our whole civilization. It is indeed human dignity itself they want to destroy. They despise the great spiritual heritage of Greek and Roman antiquity and of Christianity. In short, they despise these traditions which are really the foundation of the culture of the white race. The Greek conception of human dignity includes the conception of freedom and education. Only free and thinking human beings deserve the name "human beings." Christianity, for its part, has brought us the conception of sympathy and neighbourly love. Christianity teaches "Ye are all equal in the sight of God. Humanity is one family. Since all human beings are children of God, and since the Saviour, Jesus Christ, died for them all." What then are the ideas most hated by the Nazis? The ideas of freedom and the ideas of sympathy and neighbourly love. The Greek and the Christian idea—the two great European ideas par excellence. The concept of democracy is a heritage of Roman and Greek antiquity and is compatible with Christian ideality. As a matter of fact, democracy is nothing but the logical political manifestation of Christianity. The racially pure state which the Nazis preach, the thought of one chosen and elected race, in this case the so-called Nordic race, is un-Christian and un-European. (Applause)

That this idea should be propagated and believed by the Germans, just as Germans, is funny to boot, for the Germans actually belong to a very mixed race. The Swedes, the Norwegians or the Danes would have had better reason to be proud of their pure blood of their race. If the German Fuehrers would be at all consistent they would say the world should belong to the Scandinavians, since they represent the Nordic race, but none of them has ever given utterance to such an idea. Quite the contrary, they say the Scandinavians too must belong to Germany because they are Nordic, for the ultimate aim of all Nazi ideality is that everything that is Nordic and Germanic should belong to Germany. Everything which is not Nordic or Germanic should be ruled by Germany.

No civilized person, of course, could come to any sort of understanding with people who harbour such ideas. No one can as much as carry on a discussion with them, nor would anything be gained by a discussion. This idea of the Nazis prevents any kind of a profound discussion. Finally, they refuse to give credence to any intellectual argument. The only thing they believe in is brutal force and actual power. There is no possibility to come to terms with them or to convince them. The only possible manner to gain any ground against them is to be neither weak nor fearsome, but strong and fierce, though civilized.

The one German minority which really needs and really deserves the sympathy and the active help of the world is the German minority opposition to Hitler. The Fuehrer does not represent the nation. The other Germany, the better Germany, the Germany of the good, great tradition is still alive. We just called it the German minority, and still we have certain doubts if this calculation is accurate, if it is fair altogether. However, the minority in question happens to be a highly important one. Maybe it is a minority, maybe it isn't a minority any longer, but has become a majority for quite a while, embracing the most various, the most different elements of the nation, intellectuals and working men, aristocrats and socialists, conservatives and pious Catholics, Jews, and pious Protestants. All of them have to keep silence for the time being. All of them are going through a very hard and cruel school. They begin to understand how precious liberty is after they have lost it. They didn't appreciate, they didn't love their liberty enough as long as they had it.

The Weimar Republic was given to the Germans as a result of the consequences of the military defeat. It never was really popular among the Germans and they never had enough self-confidence. The Republic was weary. It allowed the Nazis to excite, to confuse the minds of the German people with cheap but very efficient propaganda slogans. The really mighty influential people in Germany, the men of the heavy industries, and the set around the old General von Hindenburg have backed Hitler from the beginning of his career and this set of people really called him to power. The German people didn't call him. It is often also forgotten that the last really free election in the fall of 1932 was a very embarrassing failure for the Nazis. However, the German people accepted him. They believed his promises. They hoped everything would come better now.

Please don't think that just the Jews are suffering in the Third Reich. Of course the fate of this minority is a most intolerable one, but still, the Jews didn't expect anything good from Hitler, whereas the people who trusted him, who believed him, who expected the best thing from him are maybe suffering in an even more cruel way, because they are disappointed.

One little story is quite significant. On one of the main streets of Vienna a Jew is walking, crying bitterly. He meets a man he knows slightly, an Austrian citizen, who used to be an ardent Nazi in the Schuschnigg era. This Austrian citizen says to the Jew, "Well, my dear Mr. Cohen, why are you crying? After all, they didn't promise anything to you. It is we who have a right to cry."

Don't forget, Hitler's infernal hatred against the Jewish race—the one real, honest and consistent feeling, maybe, that he has got — is highly significant in many respects. As his arch-enemy our great fighter needed a group of people which were not in a position to defend themselves. He wanted a helpless enemy. Besides, he never meant the Jews exclusively, when he was preaching his anti-Semitic nonsense. What he really hated was their intellect, their clear and critical thinking, represented to him especially by the Jews. Shrewd and intellectual means almost the same thing to the Nazis. Hitler attacks the Jewish religion but he really wants to destroy religious faith altogether. There should be only one god, the Fuehrer, and he has to be worshipped. Conceptions like that of the Nordic race involving the honour of the nation have become idols everybody is supposed to adore. The fanatical anti-Semitism of the Nazis is nothing but an especially ugly phase of their ruthless paganism. Nazidom is directed against Christianity, above all. It really means another outburst of the old Germanic hatred against Christianity, an outburst of an especially cheap and perverted sort.

It is significant that among the most famous victims of the Nazi regime are Catholic and Protestant priests, as well as Jewish socialists or pacifists or democrats. The Germanic pagans persecute every kind of humanitarian tendency, religious or socialistic. It doesn't mean much difference to them.

Certain events, for instance, like the persecution of the religious and racial minorities in Germany concern the entire civilization. They concern the civilized world, even if they happen abroad. Mankind is a unit and our civilization is based on a few very simple principles and ideals, most of them belonging to the spiritual heritage of Christianity. If one nation, one government, neglects and threatens the most important, the most sacred of those principles and ideas, the dignity and safety of mankind are endangered as well. The dignity and safety of mankind are matters which concern, which should concern everybody. Everybody should react most definitely against the aggressor who attacks and threatens these principles. There won't be any peace, no peace in honour, or no peace in our time, as long as organized brutality is ruling in the centre of the Continent.

This dreadful march of Fascism could still be stopped. The democracies if they stick together are still much stronger than the totalitarian states, which actually are much weaker than most people think. They are weak because they are not really loved by their peoples. The minority of thinking people is growing everywhere. People are not really so very eager to live under dictatorship, to become subjects of the totalitarian states.

There are significant, there are interesting cases. For instance, after the fall of Czecho-Slovakia, most political observers expected that now all the small countries of the Balkans would surrender and would accept the German hegemony without any further resistance. Now, there is much more resistance in the Near East than anybody expected. Roumania makes a very definite anti-Nazi policy. In Jugoslavia, the Fascist Prime Minister had to leave only a few days ago, just after the visit of the Italian Foreign Minister. Poland seems to be likely to change its attitude toward Germany and to make a more pro-French policy again. Then, in Hungary, which used to be an ally of Nazi Germany, a sort of resistance against Nazification is growing and the leader of the Nazi Party is still in prison in Budapest. There is resistance everywhere. Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, are definitely opposed to Nazification. So is Switzerland. The Swiss people seem to be decided to keep, and if necessary defend, their own independence. It is quite remarkable how energetic they act, if one thinks how much endangered their situation is with the dreadful neighbour they have.

Just a few months ago I heard a very well known and very popular Swiss author addressing a public meeting in Zurich, uttering the following statement: "If the Germans think we should become citizens of the Reich because of our German language, well, then, we will have to speak French," and everybody applauded.

I think the Nazi slogan and the Nazi propaganda is losing its power. It cannot confuse and impress the people any longer. As a matter of fact, the most impressive slogan the Nazis have, and it is propaganda that was used with a great deal of skill, was to say, "Of course Naziism has many wonderful qualities but above all we are a defense mechanism against Bolshevism." This slogan was repeated all over the world and still it is nonsense.

Whenever you pronounce the word "Bolshevism," of what are most of you thinking? Of the complete destruction of our entire civilization, and that is exactly what Naziism means. Every dangerous or bad quality you may think Bolshevism may have, Naziism has actually got. Naziism means really the destruction, Naziism means chaos.

Goebbels says, "After Hitler falls we will have the chaos in Germany. After Hitler, the chaos." That is another Nazi slogan, repeated millions of times and believed by many foreigners—"After Hitler, the chaos."

But why? It is not at all my intention to defend the German people, to excuse the German people altogether. I know they are guilty in many respects, but still isn't it somehow insulting against this nation to think they wouldn't have any more creative forces to make a new order, to construct a new state and a better state, when this wrong state, this bad order finally have vanished?

After Hitler's fall, the new order. The German Republic, not bolshevistic, but truly democratic, on good intimate terms with the minorities abroad, without misusing them as an excuse for imperialistic aggressiveness. The peace in honour, the peace in our time—after Hitler's fall. Yes, the German Reich can once more become a good industrious, reliable member of the family of nations. All decent Germans wish and hope for this. The reconciliation of Germany with the entire world will be possible only when those Germans who are today persecuted by the Nazis, the German friends of peace, freedom and justice, the good German minority—or majority—will once more be able to live in their own country without fear and without shame.

I thank you. (Applause—prolonged)

The Chairman: Gentlemen, we are very much indebted to Mr. Mann for his very excellent address and for the vivid picture he has painted of the position of the minorities in Europe, and the explanation he has given of the views expressed in "Mein Kampf," the intent of the author and the objectives of Naziism. We, at this distance, have little opportunity under present conditions to obtain the views of both sides of this important subject, but the address that has just been given will enable us to appreciate more clearly the difficulties encountered by the minority in being heard. We will look forward to that new Republic referred to. We are grateful to Mr. Mann for his presentation of the problem of the minorities in Europe today. We thank you, Mr. Mann. (Applause)

"A MODERN CRUSADE AGAINST CRIME"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. HUGH H. CLEGG

Thursday, February 16, 1939.

Chairman—The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: Through the courtesy and kindness of the Honourable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice, at Washington, we are to have the privilege of hearing an address by his Senior Assistant, Mr. Hugh H. Clegg. Mr. Clegg is a Member of the Bar of the State of Mississippi. He holds a degree of Bachelor of Arts from Millsaps College, at Jackson, Mississippi, and the degree of LL.B. from the George Washington University at Washington, D.C. Rather than pursue the career of Barrister he chose the vocation of a Peace Officer and joined the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He served in various administrative and other capacities in Atlanta, Georgia, Chicago and Washington, and seven years ago he was appointed Assistant Director, which office he holds today.

The officers of the Bureau are noted for their self-sacrifice and devotion to duty, as well as for their splendid record in tracing criminals of the most serious type and bringing them before the Courts of Justice of the United States. I can assure you, Gentlemen, when Mr. Clegg has concluded his address you will agree with me that we are indeed indebted to Mr. Hoover and to Mr. Clegg. Mr. Clegg has chosen as his subject, "A Modern Crusade Against Crime." I have pleasure in introducing Mr. Clegg. (Applause)

MR. HUGH H. CLEGG: Mr. President, Mr. Consul-General, Mr. Attorney-General, Distinguished Guests and Members of The Empire Club of Canada: I am very happy to be here and I am particularly pleased that I have the privilege of bringing to you a message of greetings from the Director of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation, the Honourable John Edgar Hoover. We, and I am sure my brother officers at this table would join with me, are particularly proud of the fact that here in our two great Commonwealths, the specialized interests of our citizenship are willing and, in fact, are permitted to meet together to give thought and study and consideration to a fundamental problem of government, that of law enforcement. Retrospectively, we learn that it has not always been thus, for when the world was emerging from chaos and black night, the weak were set upon by the strong, and the longest tooth, the sharpest claw and the most stubborn powers of resistance in combat were the important and dominating factors. There was a law that "the weak shall go to the wall and only the strong shall survive." That was the code upon which was predicated the so-called administration of justice of the day. It was a policy of exaggerated individualism, where the injured party was the investigator, the prosecutor, the jury, the judge, and, all too frequently, the executioner.

In the progress and evolution of criminal sociology, we have reached a point today where we recognize that every factor engaged in a programme of law enforcement must be manned by a personnel that has been carefully selected, that is well adapted and that has been carefully trained for the performance of their respective duties. We know our Judges must be learned in law, that they must possess that poise and dignity and bearing that befits their position. We know our prosecutors must be trained in law, must be vigorously alert to defend our property, our lives and our rights, but did you ever stop to think that the first step in any programme of law enforcement is the police or the investigation problem? Before your Judge is called upon to impose sentence in a criminal case, before your prosecutor has an opportunity to try a defendant, first the investigative bodies must solve the crime, and apprehend the criminal.

It is therefore equally logical, I believe, to say that those engaged in the business of enforcing the law should likewise be carefully selected, well adapted and adequately trained for the performance of their duties. We know you recognize that fact in Canada for you remember that it was in 1809 that the first organized police force in the history of the world was established in London, England, and the first organization of police agencies having jurisdiction over a rural area was the establishment of your own fine Royal Canadian Mounted Police. We are very happy in the Federal Bureau of Investigation to be able to co-operate with your Mounted Police, with your Provincial Police, and with your municipal law enforcement agencies. In fact, it might be said that when the law enforcement agencies of the United States and the law enforcement agencies of Canada are joined with the citizens of both nations, they are then actively engaged in a crusade against crime and criminals.

Philip of France and Richard, the Lion-Hearted, joined by the Kings of all Christendom, set about to rescue the sacred soil from the cruel Saracen. Joined by thousands of brave knights, actuated by deep religious impulses, motivated by the highest type of practical idealism, they set out to redeem the Holy Land that was trodden under foot by the enemies of the faith. The brightest pages of all history are those that reflect incidents and stories of such practical idealism such as the Crusades, the legends of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, the activities of people seeking liberty and independence, and the activities of those hardy pioneers who conquered the western plains. These situations are typical of such practical idealism.

I would like to discuss with you, because you are acquainted with the work in your own nation, and because I have been requested to do so, the particular part that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been playing in its special sector of this crusade against crime. Those of us who have the honour and pleasure of being a member of that organization, although knowing it was established in 1808, recognize it was in 1924 that the real foundation for this modern crusade began, for in that year the then Attorney-General of the United States, who is today a Justice of the Supreme Court of our nation, placed the shield and armour of authority on the shoulders of a young man, as Director of the F.B.I. That young man, the Honourable J. Edgar Hoover, then 28 years of age, was a native of the District of Columbia and, as they know there all too well, was not entitled to the privilege of voting. He was, therefore, peculiarly free from all political and other undesirable influences from which law enforcement should be completely divorced.

He attacked the problem in what appeared a logical manner, for first, he began a study of the forces of the enemy in our country, and here is what he found. He saw an army of crime and criminals parading by — 4,600,000 criminals are in the line of march of the enemy, and every year they commit 1,500,000 major crimes in the United States of America. As this parade marches by we see in every battalion of 1,000 persons 303 that have marched down the same parade ground before, as evidenced by the fact that previously they have been convicted of a serious crime or offence. In every company of 100, there are 18 who have not yet reached voting age; 35 are less than 25 years of age, and 51 per cent are less than the age of 30. It marches by—and as it marches, every 39 minutes we might ask that the muffled drums sound. signifying that a human life has been sacrificed as a result of criminal activity. Every 22 seconds, the muted trumpet can, in fact, blow, signifying that another serious crime has been committed in the United States. As this army of crime goes marching by it is marching down a highway that is being paved with $15,000,000 in American money every single year.

Now, let us examine just one or two examples from this Satanic army, as it goes marching by. The first example we shall examine under our microscope is Homer Van Meter, a member of John Dillinger's gang. and far more clever than Dillinger ever hoped to be. We find him with forged credentials entering a little bank in South Dakota, representing himself as a

National Bank Examiner from Washington. He was greeted most cordially by the President of the Bank, who desired to make a good impression on the so-called "big shot" from Washington. He introduced him to members of the staff, showed him the safety devices installed in the bank, exhibited the safety deposit vault where the money, securities and valuables were stored, and even invited the President of a rival bank, just across the street, to come over and meet the distinguished gentleman. They also gave a luncheon for him in the local hotel. Needless to say, within three weeks the bank was robbed of several thousands of dollars as an additional tribute to the cunning of that type of criminal.

Just three weeks later, in a little town of Indiana, this same criminal, with John Dillinger, drove up in front of the Police Department. Leaving Dillinger in the car, because his picture had been advertised too widely, he went into the police station and introduced himself to the Chief of Police in this small town. To the Chief he stated, "I represent the 'New Detective Story Magazine.' I have been commissioned by my editor to come here and write a story about the methods you have been employing that have been so successful in preventing kidnapping and bank robbery in this particular community. The Chief of Police gave his version of the proper administration of a police organization in a city of that size.

Now, at the end of a lengthy interview, Van Meter stated, "Now, we would really like to put on a drive on behalf of your department and see that you are furnished with the equipment and supplies that you really need. How well equipped are you in your need for firearms?" The Chief, with a show of pride, exhibited several wall cabinets, filled with machine guns, high power rifles and bullet-proof vests. It so happened that Dillinger's gang had been run out of an apartment and forced to abandon their arms and ammunition two nights before. The next morning they didn't need anything further; their supplies had been completely replenished.

There is another type of criminal. They are clever —"clever" is perhaps not the word, but they are possessed of that native, almost beast-like type of cunning. Such a man was Neil Maconolgue. He resembled in facial appearance quite a famous motion picture actor, and he actually made "personal appearances" at theatres, using the name of the actor. All the young ladies fell in love and they lost not only their hearts but their pocketbooks, as well, and Neil Maconolgue was sentenced to the penitentiary. But as is too often true, he was soon out again.

While an inmate of the penitentiary he had become acquainted with a number of his fellow convicts and he had studied their handwriting and also learned something of their financial status back home. As soon as he got out, he went to the families of his former fellow inmates and represented that he could get them out on parole if they would only make a contribution of an amount named, which always included practically all their savings and accumulations. He was convicted of this and again Neil Maconolgue went to the penitentiary. But he was soon out again. On this occasion when he came out he would go into a town where he had just read in the papers that a rather prominent, but not particularly wealthy citizen had just died. He would go to the railroad station and telephone the undertaker who was handling the funeral arrangements, something like this: "Mr. Undertaker, in the years of my youth the deceased befriended me. Now, at this, the moment of sadness and bereavement on the part of the family, I would like to repay that life-long indebtedness. I would like to arrange for a funeral much more elaborate and much more expensive than the family can afford. Being a modest sort of person I prefer to remain in the background, so I will send the remittance by messenger." A cheque for always six hundred to eight hundred dollars more than the total cost of the funeral arrangements was sent by messenger to the undertaker, and the balance in cash was returned by the undertaker to the criminal, and the cheque would be returned by the bank to the undertaker marked "No such account"—and again Neil Maconolgue went to the penitentiary.

And in and out and in and out, six other times but I won't bore you with those details. Finally, we find him an inmate of a penitentiary of the State of California. He had been in and out so frequently that the time had now come when he must do something very unusual to play upon the heart strings of our sob-sister sentimentalists who are far more interested in the personal welfare of one criminal parasite than they are in protecting society as a whole from such an habitual crook. "Poetry ought to do the trick," he thought, "especially if I could write a poem about Mother—that would bring tears to the eyes." So he proceeded to write a poem, which was adopted by one organization as their official Mother's Day poem, written by that convict while in a penitentiary. A few verses, if I can remember correctly, go something like this:

I would like to send you a dewdrop,
  Smiling in sweet repose,
As it sparkles, nestling in perfume,
  Deep in the heart of a rose.

And later on, when the trumpet calls,
  And I trek to the great unknown,
She will meet me there, she will plead my cause,
  And I'll know that I'm not alone.

Then all my failure will be success,
  The hardest work but play,
But if squarely the game of life I've played,
  That will be my Mother's Day.

"If squarely the game of life I've played?" I mention the fact that Neil Maconolgue was apprehended a few months ago by special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at Atlantic City, New Jersey, and was again sentenced to the penitentiary, and when I recently left Washington, no report to the contrary having been received, he is likely in that penal institution today.

Since we have this type of criminal, as well as the bloodthirsty kill crazy type in the line of march against which we must wage our crusade, it is necessary to fix standards of enlistment. So, in 1924, Mr. Hoover established a qualification for all who wished to enlist under the banner of the F.B.I. Hereafter, he stated, all those wishing to join the organization must at the time of their appointment be between the ages of 23 and 35, must be possessed of a law degree from a law school of recognized standing, or else be an expert accountant. Those qualifications may seem high. If they are we are proud that they are high, because of the fact that the accomplishments these men have been able to make have justified the establishment of those standards. Ninety-five per cent of all cases selected by the prosecution for trial, in spite of the hazards of jury trial, and in spite of varying types of prosecutive effort, result in convictions.

We are glad a crusade has an idealism of a practical sort. Therefore, we are proud of the fact that in a high percentage of cases we were able to establish the innocence of the party accused. There is an obligation on law enforcement agencies, not only to ensure the conviction of the guilty but also to protect and acquit the innocent.

These men, after selection, are carefully trained for fourteen weeks, and brought back once each year for a course of retraining in order to keep them up to date in the rapidly progressing art and science of law enforcement.

We also have, under the personal direction of Mr. Hoover, the F.B.I. National Police Academy, its purpose being to permit the designation of one selected representative from each law enforcement agency for training. They come to Washington for a period of twelve weeks, take a course of training, return to their Departments and give the benefit of their experience and training to the other members of their organization. We are happy to tell you that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police sent a very fine, distinguished and able representative to one of the recent schools. At the present time in Washington the Quebec Provincial Police Department has a representative attending this school, and I have just been informed by your General Williams that he plans at an early date to send one of his representatives from your own Provincial Police Force to Washington for the purpose of taking this course of training. We are glad to welcome them and I am glad to tell you further, it is our very great pleasure to work with your own Provincial Police Department, under the leadership of General Williams, and also your own municipal police organization under Mr. Hoover's personal friend, General Draper. (Applause)

If we are to have a real crusade, we must have, of course, an Intelligence Division, so in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington, we have a finger print identification bureau, with more than 9,900,000 finger print cards that have been sent in by police agencies throughout our countries. There are ten prints on each card—99,000,000 individual finger prints, and no two of them have ever been found alike, unless made with the same finger of the same hand of the same individual. They come in to Washington at the rate of 5,000 a day, as the finger prints of arrested persons, and in addition to that, around 1,800 every day of law-abiding citizens who want their finger prints on file for personal identification purposes. We are great believers in environment and we don't place the finger prints of the law-abiding citizens alongside of those of criminals. We keep them in special cabinets, marked "Personal Identification," and in case they become victims of amnesia or are reported as unknown dead, it is possible to identify them by this means.

Also, we have established there a scientific crime detection laboratory. The same instinctive urge that has caused men to create new inventions and make new discoveries has caused those in the field of law enforcement to adopt and adapt these inventions and discoveries to the art and science of law enforcement. There, we have borrowed from the physician the ultra-violet ray for the purpose of eliminating the criminal parasite. The ultra-violet ray will cause most substances to fluoresce with a different colour for each element. A prisoner or a criminal likes to communicate with a member of his gang. He goes into the cell and writes a letter to one of his fellow confederates outside the jail, and the letter, sent from the prison, may read something like this: "Dear Bill: Go down to the pool hall, see 'Gyp, the Blood,' get the $3.00 he owes me, and buy some cigarettes and send to me. It is awfully lonesome in jail with nothing to smoke."

And written between the lines is a secret message. It may be written with secret ink, with sweet milk, lemon juice, onion juice or an aspirin tablet dissolved in water. Written between the lines is this message: "Have the high-powered car and the 'Tommy-Gun' at the east gate next Thursday night at 10.30 p.m. That is the time to make a break from this jail." When placed under the ultra-violet ray that secret message will fluoresce, and shine like a neon light in a street sign.

Also borrowed from the physician is the X-ray machine. Just a few years ago, the late Vice-President, Charles Curtis, received a series of threatening letters. Shortly afterward he received an imposing looking package. I don't blame him for being afraid to open it. He called on Mr. Hoover to send one of his operatives who was qualified to handle explosives. He went to the Vice-President's Chambers and brought the package back to the laboratory. They made a fluorscopic study of the package. They took an X-ray photograph and found that it contained a beautiful hand-carved gavel sent by an admiring friend from his native Kansas. No conviction was obtained in that case but if that package had contained a bomb, it could have been studied in such a manner that the trigger arrangement would have been observed and the package opened without danger to the operative handling this particular device.

In this laboratory they make a study of handwriting, identification of bullets and identification of firearms. The identification of firearms is rather interesting. A bridge game was in progress in a little town in Dakota. It was the 4th of July and the only noise outside was the occasional exploding of a firecracker down at the fair grounds and the lazy drone of an aeroplane motor overhead. Suddenly one of the women in the bridge game screamed and blood was seen coming from a wound in her shoulder. She had been shot. The premises were searched but no suspect was found. No one was known who had a motive for shooting the lady. The police had the physician very carefully remove the bullet and it was sent to the technical laboratory of the F.B.I. in Washington. There, the experts know that the rifling on the inside of the barrel of every gun will leave distinctive markings on the bullets that go hurling through and no two guns leave identical marking on bullets. So, on receipt of that particular bullet it was studied and there was no other to compare favourably with it, and it was filed away.

Eight months before in a little town in Ohio, an attendant was cleaning up the bar of a German beer garden. He was getting ready to go home when suddenly he looked up into the end of the barrel of a gun held by a robber. The cash register was robbed and the beer garden attendant was killed, so he could not later identify the robber. The coroner, at the request of the police very carefully removed the bullet from the body. It was kept for eight months in the hope that a gun would be found in possession of some suspect, which would fire bullets with identical markings. No gun and no such suspect were found and eight months later that bullet was sent to our laboratory. Within four hours, telegrams went to Dakota and also to Ohio advising that the same gun that had injured the lady in Dakota had been used in killing the beer garden attendant in Ohio, a thousand miles away.

Investigation by police disclosed that a man was working in a rubber plant in Ohio. He had gone to his home in Dakota one summer on vacation and had taken an aeroplane ride over his home town. He was somewhat inebriated and to properly celebrate the 4th of July he had pulled the gun from his pocket and fired several shots. The noise of the explosion of the gun was drowned by the noise of the aeroplane motor but one of the bullets came down through an open window and struck the lady in the shoulder, and left its telltale trademarks which led to the subsequent conviction and life imprisonment of the criminal in Ohio for the crime committed there.

This shows not only the value of the study by scientific means of the evidence of crime, but also the necessity of co-ordination between law enforcement agencies of the country, in order that information concerning criminals and violators of the law might be available at one central clearing house.

Now, in order for this crusade to be successful, it is necessary that law enforcement agencies co-operate. We are glad to salute the fine officials you have in Canada who give us unstinted, whole-hearted and intelligent co-operation. We are also glad that we can call upon the citizens through the local police of your Dominion to aid us from time to time, as many of you have done in the past. In any crusade against an enemy the support of the citizen is necessary. We want to enlist in behalf of your police and in our behalf, your support. The greatest job you can do as citizens is to prevent enlistments in the ranks of the enemy. For your boys and girls, you can see that they are furnished homes instead of hovels; that they are given games instead of guns; that in their schools they are given instruction not only in the professions and craftsmanship, but likewise in patriotism and in character. Yes, they should be taught sports, but sportsmanship should be recognized as even more important, and in our churches a little practice with the preaching all tend to establish the end toward which we are all striving.

You can see that our appropriating bodies do not adopt a penurious "penny wise and pound foolish" attitude when equipping these soldiers who are fighting the battle, not once each generation, but every day and every night and every hour of every day and every night, in defense of you and your homes, your rights and your lives.

With your co-operation and with your assistance in this crusade which we are waging, and which we must win, we shall win and then we shall have rescued these, our Holy Lands, from the enemies of the faith. Thank you. (Hearty applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Clegg, on behalf of the members of The Empire Club of Canada, as well as on behalf of those Canadians, and those of your fellow citizens who have listened to the proceedings of this Club, we cannot say how much we have enjoyed your talk. It has been a revelation, Sir, to most of us, I am sure, although perhaps not to some of those at the head table today, to know that the tracing of the criminals and the recording of their activities have become such a scientific accomplishment. Not only, Sir, do we compliment you upon a wonderful address, but we thank you most cordially for having come and given us these words of instruction. Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"CONFLICTS OF DOCTRINES IN EUROPE"

AN ADDRESS BY JAN MASARYK

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, February 23, 1939.

Immediately following the seating of the head table guests, the President stated that it was the custom in Czecho-Slovakia to offer bread and salt to a guest upon entering another person's home. Thereupon Miss Margaret Hunter, dressed in Czecho-Slovakian costume, approached Mr. Masaryk, who partook of the bread and salt which she offered him.

THE PRESIDENT: My first word today will be one of cordial welcome to the ladies who have so kindly come to the hotel to see for themselves how the proceedings of the Empire Club of Canada are conducted.

(Applause)

We also thank most graciously Dr. Russell Marshall who, at considerable inconvenience, has produced the lovely music to which we have listened.

Ladies, and Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada, only once in so often does a President have the privilege of introducing a man such as it is to be my pleasure to introduce today. We extend a most cordial welcome to our guest, Mr. Jan Masaryk, son of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder and the first President of Czecho-Slovakia. Mr. Masaryk was educated at Prague University and graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts. He came to the United States, and following the establishment of the State of Czecho-Slovakia, was the first Chargé d'Affaires for the newly formed State at Washington. Later he returned to Prague to assist his father and Dr. Benes. For the past fifteen years he has been the Czech Minister to the Court of St. James. When his retirement was announced last year, he was acclaimed by the press as the most popular European diplomat in London. The English people loved him, and he was urged to take up residence in England. This he has done. He has come to the United States and Canada to speak for the cause of Democracy and he is devoting much time and energy in addressing audiences from coast to coast in both countries.

It is my proud privilege to present to you Mr. Jan Masaryk, who will speak upon the subject, "Conflicts of Doctrines in Europe." Mr. Masaryk. (Applause)

MR. JAN MASARYK: Ladies and Gentlemen: I am especially glad to be back in the British Empire and especially proud to be allowed to address your Club. I will make a confession to you. When I arrived here in this country—I came here not to speak, as a matter of fact, I came to rest but I have not done much of that—I was secretly hoping that The Empire Club would invite me. I had followed the activity of your Club for many years and many of my friends, both from England and elsewhere, had had the honour of being invited, and I was just a little bit jealous, so thank you very much for letting me come.

Before I go any farther I would like to dispel certain rather unintelligent talk that has been going around about Europe in general, and England, especially, as being down and out. I have heard that said on this side of the ocean since I arrived; and, having lived in England for fifteen years where I spent thirteen and a half very happy years and one particularly unhappy one, I assure you that it is all damned nonsense. England is a very vigorous democracy which sometimes, as is the prerogative of democracy, elects a government which occasionally does something which doesn't suit all the inhabitants; but that is why we have democratic institutions, so when we elect one that we don't like six months after the election we wait patiently for the next one. Other countries use other methods of disposing of political opponents. I pray God that in none of the countries belonging to the British Empire will that ever come to pass.

There is another thing very much on my heart, and when I say that I will try to get down to business. The co-operation of Great Britain and America is necessary. (I am not speaking of submarines or cannons or poison gases. I am not a specialist in those wares.) But the intellectual, the ethical and the moral co-operation between those two great democracies is essential if the civilization of the world is to be saved. As I put it the other day, people who read Shakespeare and the Bible must stick together—and it is more necessary at this moment than ever before.

In this connection I must say I am not a propagandist. I have lived in England long enough—I love England and they have been very kind to me—to have seen certain things that I didn't like altogether. Don't think I come here to spread propaganda for England or the United States. I speak on behalf of myself. I represent no government—nobody at all. I am what anyone would call in business "Jan Masaryk, Limited"—very, very limited!

Let us get a very quick survey of what has happened to us in the last twenty years. Just about twenty years ago you remember we went up and down the street and shouted that we had fought a war to make the world safe for Democracy. Look where we are today! I am standing before you, Ladies and Gentlemen, and pleading for all of us to unite to save what is left of Democracy for the world. In bringing the situation to pass that we are going through today perhaps you are as little to blame as any country—you Canadians—but nobody is altogether without blame.

In 1918, some people thought that they had won the war. You remember then that they were labouring under that impression, and for some years after the war, that they were the victors and the others were the vanquished. I am sure this misconception has been definitely evacuated from our brains and our hearts. There are no victors and there should be no victor if there were another war. Anyway the victorious nations (and ours was one of them, and therefore when I do speak against certain phases of the Treaty of Versailles I will sound a little ungrateful) met in Paris and we prepared that remarkable edifice, the Treaty of Versailles which, with its two little children, the Treaty of Saint-Germain and the Treaty of Trianon, were responsible for Czecho-Slovakia, such as it was in 1918.

The Treaty of Versailles was an honest document, made by people who understood their business. There were all kinds of experts and delimitation commissions, and if you compare the Treaty of Versailles with what has been called the Treaty of Munich, I would certainly say that Versailles would be a classic. But we in Europe very erroneously thought that Versailles was the end, that within and around Versailles, such as it was, we were going to build a happy existence for the nations of Europe. We were not. The mentality of the victorious nations was far too stringent, far too adherent to points that would have been better left alone.

The League of Nations in Geneva—where I was a delegate for several years and which I know intimately—with the best intentions tried to operate the Peace Treaty. There never was enough flexibility to make the so-called vanquished people realize that they could come into the League of Nations and the community of European nations in a decent and brotherly manner. Instead of that we talked of reparations. We thought Germany was going to pay for fifty or a hundred years. Really, it was a remarkable lack of the knowledge of psychology to believe that.

I remember myself, in 1932, when sitting in the Reparations Committee with the late Monsieur Briand, saying what I thought about reparations. I said, "I am sure they are not going to pay." I was then considered a very dangerous left-radical in Geneva. Look where we are today with reparations. Look where we are with the League of Nations. Look where we are with the Treaty of Versailles. We have ourselves—with the help of the dictators—literally dismantled the Treaty of Versailles and, unfortunately, we haven't put anything in its place.

When I speak of the Treaty of Versailles it has been responsible for the existence of my real estate, but we have taken the roof away and the windows and the doors, and now it is cold and stormy, and Europe stands in this wretched edifice, shivering, while other people are progressing very rapidly in achieving what they consider the new European civilization.

Now, before I go any further, we must look at the two regimes facing each other, the two regimes as they met in Munich. I haven't come here to cry or to complain or to weep and be pitied. I dislike being pitied more than anything else in the world. Naturally, I have been badly hurt. My country has been treated in an unprecedented manner in history. We divided up Austria-Hungary, not too cleverly, after an awful war of four years. But this has happened during peace time, and my little country, let us say, has been sold by its allies and deserted by its friends. You see the two regimes facing each other in Munich. On one side, the outspoken—perhaps a little too outspoken sometimes—dictators, with their remarkable banging on the table, and on the other side, the western democracies, quite dignified, protected against rain, but not able to stand up to the other side of the table.

Only yesterday, when I was speaking, a simile came to me which I make bold to repeat. You see, when you have a single message, as I have (it is the liberty of the human soul), you are bound to repeat. Let me repeat my simile. I compared the thing in Munich to a poker game. Some of you, with or without the permission of your wives, play poker, do you not? On one side were people who did all the bidding, and kept raising the ante all the time, and on the other side people who were not calling. It stands to reason the man who plays and isn't called is going to win. A third party was Czecho-Slovakia who supplied the chips for both parties. Whatever happened we were the losers. I say again, and I repeat, that Mr. Chamberlain did the best he knew how. He really believed at that time in this new invention called "appeasement" and Munich was to be a great foundation stone to achievement.

Well, I won't take Munich as a classical example, because the statesmen of the four governments assembled there had the not too difficult job of giving away something that didn't belong to them; the giving away of a small country which couldn't defend itself against the whole world, and it didn't need a special sagacity, statesmanship, or bravery to accomplish that fact.

But having said that about Munich, I will say that the theme on which I wish to elaborate my short talk isn't the result of Munich, which is terribly painful so far as we are concerned, so far as my countrymen are concerned, and which is perhaps not too good for Central Europe, but the methods employed frighten me. You see, we did have a thing called international law in Europe. I am sitting next to a great lawyer at this table. I think he will agree with me that the legal aspect of international intercourse has been disappearing very rapidly and it is that which worries me. We have, I don't want to say too quickly but quickly enough, an approach to the Middle Ages where the fellow who had the bigger stick got the bigger price. And it is the method of the thing that is worrying me. I say to myself, how long is this going to last? There are a few other little places that these people could give away that don't belong to them. There are not too many. The situation is narrowing down. As I would say, it is getting close to "poppa's pocket" now. The day may come when they will be asked to give something themselves which is quite a different bag of tricks. When you see them giving away Czecho-Slovakia—a lovely province down in Czecho-Slovakia—where the people were cut off after Munich without a minute's notice, it is a different trick than giving up Tunisia, or little Corsica or even Savoia.

But you see also at the same time the Far Eastern situation. You see the Mediterranean situation. It seems to me that these two regimes, the tired democracy on the one side, and the young and boisterous dictatorship on the other side, should come together and talk things over before it is too late.

I see that yesterday, or the day before, I think, the House of Commons has voted an additional pittance of

£400,000,000 sterling ($2,000,000,000) for armaments, which means that automatically the other side is going to try to make it $2,100,000,000, because, as I said before, they do believe in raising the ante!

If we concentrate on piling up armaments there is only one way out. Somebody, somehow, somewhere, will find a match, and then I fear for our civilization.

I would like to say one word about the economic situation. I know there are a great many in the room who know infinitely more about economics than I do, but I have kept to the political aspect of the situation. And I will come back to politics. Europe was divided into national groups. For instance, Czecho-Slovakia was a small country, but there are countries much smaller. There is Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania—countries with a million and a half and two million inhabitants. Giving them national independence was well and good. Czecho-Slovakia was an historical necessity. If there hadn't been a war we likely could have got along with Austria and perhaps have attained some sort of autonomy; but once the war started there was absolutely no chance of saving Austria-Hungary. We have been blamed for having broken up Austria. It is not true. When Emperor Francis Joseph died in 1916 it was doomed. The only thing that would have saved Austria was a victory of the Central Powers, in which case it would have then become a little appendix of Germany. Anyway, we cannot stop the nations in Central and Eastern Europe claiming their own independence, nationally. The great mistake—and we all were involved and Czecho-Slovakia is as much to blame as all the other countries—is that all of these people were made economically self-sufficient or they tried to be economically self-sufficient. I give as an example our own neighbour, Hungary. Before the war Eastern Czecho-Slovakia supplied all of the Balkans and a great part of southern Russia with textiles. After the war our Agrarian Party, quite justified from their point of view, began to build up agriculture to such an extent that in several years agriculture was practically self-sufficient in every country in meat, cereals and all that sort of thing. Before that we used to get these things from Hungary. Our textiles were paid for with industrial products. Well, due to the so-called self-sufficiency drive in Europe, the Hungarians couldn't buy our textiles. The result was that I, myself, was instrumental in dismantling many factories in Bohemia and transferring them to Hungary where they started an industry really not to their liking and took away something from us. Things of that sort Europe is full of. The idea of economic self-sufficiency, the building of economic barriers which still exist in Europe and from which no country is altogether exempt are just as much to blame for the general situation in Europe as the political difficulties, because if people cannot buy and sell, if the exchange of goods stops, the political situation *ipso facto* becomes more complex and the feeling of distrust and hate arises.

Now, I think that this is being seen by the rulers in Europe, all of them. I think when they stop and consider the situation they realize in which way their salvation lies. And I must say another thing which is apt to be controversial, and before I do so let me state very emphatically, on my honour, I am not a Bolshevik. I have absolutely no use for the regime in Russia and I am perfectly horrified to think that in the year of our Lord, 1939, we can have a regime which puts up against the wall people who disagree with them. Nevertheless, I feel that if Europe is to be saved we have got to take Russia into consideration and I hope when a Conference comes that Russia will not be left out of it. Let me repeat, there is no person in this room who dislikes the regime more than I do. I have seen it with my own eyes and I think it is a terrible thing. What we have been doing is establishing the Four Power idea in Europe, leaving Russia out. Russia, after all, and whatever the regime, is a very great Empire, extremely rich, as you know. I am told by my friends in the Bank of England that Russia is going to have a bigger output of gold this year than the British Empire. They have untold national resources and I think it would be wise not to disregard them. When we hear the world Russia, we should not close our eyes and ears, as many of us are in the habit of doing.

I think His Majesty's Government in Great Britain is rather of this opinion, because I saw only yesterday in the paper that my friend, Mr. Hudson, the Overseas Trade Secretary, is on his way to Russia to talk of a closer commercial tie between the Empire and Russia. I see that at the moment there is a very important German delegation in Moscow, negotiating an agreement on a rather extensive basis. I submit, respectfully, that if Mr. Hitler can send a delegation to Moscow, I don't see why all the rest of us shouldn't be able to do the same.

But please don't think I have come here to paint propaganda for Russia, Moscow, or any other political doctrine.

Now, let us face the two opposing regimes in Europe. In that connection I must say a few words about the magnificent propaganda of the dictatorial powers. I have made a rather detailed study of that and believe me, specifically, the German propaganda machine is one of the outstanding, perhaps *the* outstanding achievement for disseminating information. I submit respectfully that most of the information is not true. Nevertheless, the way it gets to people is remarkable and I only give you one example, not to bore you. I could give several examples, but I think this is to the point.

You all remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, about three years ago you suddenly began to hear the word "Sudeten Germany." Is there one person in this world who five years ago had heard the word "Sudeten German"? Certainly the whole world has since reverberated with the wrongs inflicted on the Germans by my father. Suddenly, it was the Czecho-Slovaks, of all people, who were oppressing the minorities. While the shooting was going on in Russia with great zest, while the Jews were being treated in a manner in Germany also without precedent in the other countries—the minorities there were not being treated with silk gloves!—suddenly it was found that Czecho-Slovakia was the one country that treated its minorities very badly! I submit that no country treated its minorities better than we did. But we made a mistake. Anyway, suddenly, even in Whitehall, in London, people, right honourable gentlemen began to worry about the fate of the Sudetens under the ruthless heel of the Masaryk Government. The result was when Munich approached some of that mentality was prevailing among some of the people who took part in Munich. Now, it was our fault. We should have at once made a claim against it. The point I am now trying to make to you is that propaganda has to be answered. I am not for propaganda as such. I think propaganda the way it is being done—going to other people's houses, disrupting family life, ruining all institutions—is a sin against God; but I feel that if someone accuses us of something we know is not true, we must stand up and say it is not true and we must answer propaganda by truth. Otherwise we may all begin to believe that black is somewhat white. I feel if we do state the truth, in the end the truth will conquer.

I will give one example. You know there is a gentleman in the United States called Father Coughlin, a well-known radio speaker. Well, he chose about two weeks ago to say that explosions in London had nothing to do with Ireland but they were perpetrated by Czecho-Slovakian anarchists who came to London to blow up public buildings to make Mr. Chamberlain's situation difficult. I read that on a train and I had the honour, later, to speak to about four thousand people in Cleveland. I said, "Every gentleman knows that is a wilful untruth." Well, I haven't heard from his lawyer up to date. At that, their propaganda is magnificent.

Now, let me make a short comparison of the two regimes. Your Government, my Government, as it was —and I hope we will be able to save some of it—was based on individual liberty. Every one of our souls is something very sacred in my nation and the soul of every child is something sacred, and it is up to us who are grown up, our teachers, our clergy, to lead this soul to its salvation in a manner in which it can expand and use its own resources.

On the other side we have the absolute negation of the individual. The individual, de facto, doesn't exist. There is the state represented by one man and of late these individuals have been practically deified. I have seen prayers to all three dictators. In a magazine that I bought only yesterday coming here—I think it was either Mercury or the Readers Digest — there were printed verbatim prayers to the three dictators.

There is another difference there and I feel unless we realize ourselves what our liberties mean, what our liberties are, how much our liberties are worth, we will not be able to cope with the European situation. I am trying to say this, and I don't want to teach anyone how to run their country. It isn't up to me to tell the dictatorships that Mendelssohn's music or Wagner's music is not altogether Aryan, or that Heine's poetry is the most beautiful poetry in the German language. They must choose only literature that is Aryan. I insist on listening to Mendelssohn and I insist on reading Heine's "Lorelei." And when I have so chosen it is answering propaganda by truth. If you take a piece of music the greatest genius in music wouldn't discover the nationality of the man who wrote it, whether he had a Gothic or a Roman profile. It is the inroads on individual liberty that frighten me. I say that it is up to us democrats to make democracy a little more attractive. Let us say we must give it another coat of paint.

I have had the great pleasure and honour to speak to youngsters. I enjoy that immensely. I go to schools and to universities. Last year I went to West Point where I saw the future American officers—peace officers, I hope. I said to these children, "Look at your lovely uniforms. How nicely you march past. In the morning you get up as a citizen of a free country." I must say I had a response there. I am not especially conceited, but I thought that some of the children did realize I was telling them something worth while. It applies to all of us. We must realize that a democracy as such gives us certain prerogatives. It gives a prerogative to make mistakes. That is one of the things we all do. Czecho-Slovakia has made mistakes. But it is the proud prerogative of democracy, if you make one, acknowledge it like a man and try to correct it. In the dictatorial countries they are not allowed to make mistakes. A dictator cannot make a mistake. The minute he does he loses the most important part of his body, which is his face.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not think that war is imminent and I do think that the regimes that I have very briefly described to you can live alongside each other, but I do submit and I am absolutely convinced, there is no chance of mixing the two. There have been very honest efforts, taking a little bit of this and a little bit of that and trying to mix into something palatable. It can't be done. They will not mix. The whole foundation, the whole structure is absolutely different. We, on one side, claim that it is the right of the individual to express himself, especially, let us say, in art. I submit to you, in all humility, beautiful art of whatever sort can only be the outpouring of a free soul. You could not write lyrical poetry—Dante could not have written what he wrote if he had been restricted as to what paper he was using or what ink he was using. It could not have been done. That is getting the inroads into our souls that I object to.

The other day I happened to find a saying by one of the dictators. I don't think we have to mention any names—it doesn't matter. It will show you what I think is dangerous. This is what he says: "The plain truth is that men are tired of liberty and that the restless and hardy youth of today want to pass over the decayed corpse of the goddess of liberty to hierarchy, war and glory."

I happen to be a proud owner of a fountain pen and I wrote under this, and I would like to submit my version: "The plain truth is that men are longing to get back to individual liberty and that the restless and hardy youth of today by a little enlightened leadership would like to gather around the goddess of liberty and protect her proudly against hierarchy, war and the shocking glory of a wholesale slaughter."

The days of glory on the battle field are passed. A relative of mine—this story may make you laugh—went to China about sixty-five years ago. He went into a part of China where no white man had been. He took an interpreter and some servants and in a small rice field they saw an old Chinaman with a very big stick in his hand. He was interested in what the old gentleman was doing. He saw that the stick was too big to chase the birds away. He approached the old Chinaman through his interpreter and said, "Would you pray tell us what you are doing?" The old man said, "Certainly. There is a war around here between the two chieftains of this district and I was told there was going to be a battle this afternoon. They certainly are not going to have a battle on my field." Those were the days of heroes. Nowadays the destruction of war will affect the whole community, and if for nothing else, we people who believe in individual liberty, in the sacredness of the soul, must unite, not to die for our souls, but to live for them, to work for them and really to make this world fit for our children and their children to live in. And I am convinced if the two great democracies, Great Britain and America, co-operate that we will have gone a very long way toward achieving this goal.

I am a small unknown soldier, but I am devoting the rest of my life to what I have been talking to you about. I have had very good offers, as you may imagine, but I have decided to remain a missionary, a missionary of love instead of hate, a missionary of truth, a missionary of truth instead of lies, and I am convinced that we will see Europe—she is a worried old girl now—turn the corner, and it is up to your great country and your great neighbour to help. I repeat, that will not be by coming and getting entangled in all kinds of little troubles in Europe, but by holding fast to the principles for which your fathers gladly died and for which all of us must live.

Thank you and God bless you.

(Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Masaryk, as an evidence to the Club of the sincerity of your remarks I am going to quote a very short paragraph from an interview given by you in New York upon your arrival. This is what you said: "I have resigned my post as Czecho-Slovakian Minister to the Court of St. James, after fifteen years service in my beloved England and I shall live in exile. I am in America and I am a free and happy man. Free, you understand! I wonder if you know what it means to be free in this world today?"

Mr. Masaryk, I cannot too strongly express to you our sincere thanks for coming and giving us this wonderful and sincere picture of conditions as you see them, and as you believe them to be. I assure you, Sir, we recognize in you a high authority upon the subject upon which you have spoken and the words which you have expressed cannot fail to leave their mark, not only upon those whom you see in this room, but on those who have been listening to you over the air. Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"TRAINING BRITAIN'S YOUTH"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. JASPER H. STEMBRIDGE, F.R.G.S.

Chairman: The President—Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, March 2, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: Through the courtesy of the Oxford University Press we are to have the privilege of hearing today an address by Mr. Jasper H. Stembridge, of London, England, a noted biographer, author and lecturer. Mr. Stembridge is travelling across Canada from coast to coast for the purpose of studying our history and also observing social and economic conditions in Canada, with a view to making use of the material which he thus gathers in addresses for British audiences, in the hope of dispelling any wrong idea—if any does exist—in the mind of the average British person. In his address he will speak to us upon the subject, "Training Britain's Youth," as contrasted with the methods adopted by certain other European countries, which we are sorry to note seem to feel that a man is born to be shot by a citizen of another country, though he, himself, has no quarrel with that citizen. I am sure that it is indeed a privilege to have Mr. Stembridge with us, and I now introduce him to you. Mr. Stembridge. (Applause)

MR. JASPER H. STEMBRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: I should like to say how much I appreciated your kind invitation to lunch with your Club today. If I may say so, I accepted it with considerable diffidence for I am no after-luncheon speaker. On those few occasions when I have spoken at luncheons the coming ordeal has usually given me indigestion. At times like this one is always faced with a dilemma: whether to be wholly serious, which I must confess I always find a little difficult, or whether to try to be wholly amusing, or whether to attempt a judicious blend.

I remember one occasion when I was announced to speak on the work of an Inspector of Schools. During the lunch the Chairman turned and looked at me extremely dubiously and said, "I trust, Mr. Stembridge, you will try to make your talk as light as possible. We don't want anything too heavy at these gatherings." Well, the lunch was heavy, both literally and metaphorically, so I tried to make my talk light and spoke about the lighter side of school inspection and I thought I did rather well. When I had finished a Head Master who was present got up and after a few polite remarks, he said, "I trust Mr. Stembridge never comes to inspect the geography in my school, for I am sure he would have a most demoralizing influence on the boys."

Of course, school inspection, like other jobs, has its lighter side, especially if one is blessed with a sense of humour. I remember one occasion when I was going to inspect the work of a small country school. When I arrived the children were having an arithmetic lesson. By way of a start I thought I would lead up, as I hoped, skilfully, to a question as to the cost of so many gallons of petrol. I said: "I have just motored forty miles. How long do you think it has taken me?" There were various answers, ranging from a quarter of an hour to two hours. If they had seen my car they would have known that two hours was nearer the mark. Then I asked, "What liquid do I buy every morning?" There was a pause and one small and a little timid girl put up her hand. I said, "Yes, my dear, what is it?" She said, "Please, Sir, whisky."

Of course, as an Inspector, one has to be very careful. I well remember one day motoring along a winding country lane. Here and there were wider places where one could pass. In front of me was an oldish man on a tricycle, who seemed to be very stubborn. Would he move? He wouldn't budge. There were plenty of places to pass but he kept in the middle of the road and there I was, crawling behind, and getting hotter and crosser as I went along. At last I did get by. As I was passing him I put my head out of the window and said, "You silly old ass, why don't you get out of the way?" I went on and I finally arrived at the school I was about to inspect only to discover that the silly old ass was the Head Master.

But now I have retired from the official inspecting of schools and I am here more particularly as an unofficial educationalist and especially as a geographer. Perhaps you will therefore bear with me if I say a few words about education in general and geography in particular. I am here also as a stranger and a learner. No amount of book learning can make up for actual personal contact and I feel assured that during the few months I am in your magnificent country I shall learn much about it and return home to England much better qualified to speak and to write about it than I am now.

I once got into hot water for saying at a meeting that I thought more rubbish was written and spoken about education than any other subject. I still think so and I hope my words won't rise up against me now. Everyone who has given thought to the question seems to have a different definition to give of education. That is only natural. Such a vital and important subject must, of necessity, have many different facets. I suppose most of us realize that school education is only an addition to the much greater education of street and home. The road from school is often a greater teacher than the school itself, and the average education of a town bred boy in this highly mechanical age is, I sometimes think, rather one-sided. Of course the pupil looks at education in a very different way to the teacher, and the parent from a different angle than the prospective employer. But I think most adults are agreed that popular education must provide not only for the needs of the child, but also for the needs of the nation. We all have our own ideas about what children should be taught and how they should be taught it. I sometimes think that our school time tables are overloaded and that we should do better if we concentrated on pure subjects, for, as a shrewd, if caustic Head Master once remarked, "Young people are narrow-necked vessels into which you cannot pour much at a time without waste or running over." That is quite true, but I can assure you the modern teacher has acquired the art of filling these vessels to the very brim.

In England people have often said to me that the children in our schools waste their time over learning unnecessary subjects, that they are not taught to write properly—I am sure they are in Canadian schools—that they cannot add, that they are unable to spell, and that they do not know where New York or Melbourne or Montreal are situated. Well, we cannot all know everything, but there are certain subjects about which I am convinced every child should know something and I am quite certain that every child in this Empire of ours should know something about the world-wide organization to which he or she belongs. Here, you will perceive, comes in my pet subject, geography. I will not worry you with a dissertation as to my views on the nature and aims of modern geography, so very different from those our fathers held. For them, of course, it was a matter of dry facts, lists and tables. Today, we think it important to discover the bearings of these facts and to consider the moral and intellectual problems arising from them. In short, we wish to study the reciprocal relationship between man and nature. Perhaps I might illustrate my point by a short anecdote.

Some years ago I went into a country school where the Head Mistress was on the point of retirement. She was no longer young and beautiful. She was, I should say—I don't wish to guess at ladies' ages—well over sixty. She had done remarkably good work. Toward the end of the afternoon she said to me, "Mr. Stembridge, may I tell you a naughty story?" Well, of course it is unusual for Head Mistresses or teachers to tell naughty stories to Inspectors, and I was rather relieved when she said that the Vicar had told it to her. So I replied, "Carry on." She pulled me behind the blackboard and this is what she told me: One evening an old doctor was walking across the village allotment. I suppose out here you call them lots. In England most villages have a certain portion of ground set aside where the people in the village can grow their own vegetables and fruit. Well, this old doctor was walking across the allotment. As he went along he saw a plot of ground that had been previously neglected and there, hard at work, was a young labourer. He was doing very well and had some fine crops on the plot. The old doctor said, "Good evening. Do you know, I have never seen this plot of ground look so splendid and so magnificent all the years I have lived in this village?" The he paused and said, "Isn't it perfectly wonderful to think of this co-operation between you and the Almighty?" The young labourer straightened his back, wiped his hands across his brow and said, "Aye, Doctor, but you should have seen it when the Almighty had it by Himself."

Well, I think this does illustrate one of the ways in which man co-operates with Nature and how he makes use of the great gifts which nature has bestowed on him. As I see it, that is one of the aims of our geographical training.

Some months ago a Canadian visitor to England wrote to one of our leading papers, the "Daily Telegraph," complaining that English people knew very little about Canada. She said, "For example, I come to England. I can distinguish quite well between the speech of an Irishman, a Scotsman or an Englishman, but over here everybody takes me for an American. I have the greatest admiration for the United States but I don't want to be taken for an American."

Thereupon, an Englishman who had lived ten years in Nova Scotia wrote to the paper and said, "I have lived ten years in Nova Scotia and I cannot distinguish between the speech of a Nova Scotian and a New Englander."

Well, I am not qualified to speak on that matter, but that many English people are ignorant about Canada is regrettably true, though there are also a vast number who do take an intelligent interest in Canada and in your great Commonwealth and who realize that the political philosophy that underlay the development of our Empire during the last century will no longer suffice.

The Empire is not static. It is dynamic. It must be dynamic if it is to survive. But is it not essential that side by side with a growing sense of nationhood among our component states there must also come a closer unity, for otherwise we shall become a mere collection of nations, united only by our allegiance to a non-political throne? We have developed under an era of liberty but if that liberty we all treasure is to be preserved, then I, for one, feel that it must be backed by the united strength of all the nations composing our great Commonwealth.

We have a supreme advantage over the dictatorship states for, despite all their successes, all forms of autocracy in the end tend to crush out of their subjects that moral courage and independence which is the real strength of nations.

The great civilization moved from east to west, from Mesopotamia and Egypt to Greece, Rome and Western Europe and the British Isles, whence men came across the seas to found states in this new world, states whose culture was based on the old traditions, but on traditions reinvigorated with the spirit of the pioneer and it is perhaps not altogether idle to speculate, as we do sometimes in England, how long it will be before Canada becomes the heart and centre of our Commonwealth. We, in England, do realize that you are the greatest single unit in the Empire and that outside the British Isles you have the largest white population. We do know something of your vast resources and of the way you are using them to develop your great heritage. Our interest, naturally, will be stimulated by the forthcoming visit of the King and Queen, and whatever may be the shortcomings of our adult population, our younger generation have a very wide knowledge of the Dominion. In fact, I think no part of the Empire is better known to our youngsters than Canada, and I should like to say in passing that our knowledge is fostered by that remarkably useful publication, the Canadian News Sheet, issued by the Press Officer of Canada House, London. It is a very valuable document that is sent out monthly to our schools. This example might well be followed by other Dominions.

A few days before I left England I went into a village school and there on the wall was a large pictorial map of Canada, made by the teachers and the children, on which they proposed to follow the King's journey across the Dominion. That, you will say, is only a small thing. You are right, but it is typical of much, and this interest in the Dominion is of no vague or transitory nature.

For instance, when I was head of the Geographical Department at Denstone College, where I was for some ten years, I encouraged groups of students to collect information about different countries of the Empire, and about different parts of the world. Later, when I became Inspector of Schools, under the Board of Education, I also suggested to the teachers in Staffordshire County, where most of my work lay, that the different schools should collect similar information as well as local information about our own Staffordshire industries. This method was followed. It resulted in the gathering together of much valuable material and not only did it stimulate the interest of the children in the schools, but aroused the enthusiasm of the parents and other people connected directly or indirectly with them.

This interest culminated in the Staffordshire Geography Exhibition, the largest educational exhibition ever devoted to a single subject that has been held in Britain. It might interest you to know a little about one or two of the Canadian exhibits. One consisted of a diorama of the Canadian National Railway that took up the whole of one side of the corridor. It was made by the schoolboys and was complete with a working model of an engine and train which ran at stated intervals.

Another exhibit consisted of material illustrating your great lumber industry. That was arranged on a platform about the size of the one on which I am standing. We had large photos illustrating the different aspects of the industry, specimens of wood and models and photos of lumber camps and a large chart which showed the ramifications of the industry—the paper industry, the rayon industry, and so on.

A third exhibit consisted of a collection of letters written by school children in Nova Scotia to those in Staffordshire schools. Another exhibit was arranged by a Head Master who had a relative in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company. He got into touch with him and obtained a suit of Eskimo clothes. He also had a model made of the kayak used by Eskimos. This exhibit centred around a large model of an igloo, complete with an Eskimo family, composed of some of the children in the school. The model was extremely popular, although I regret some of the children were ill, owing to the sweets given by the visitors.

The Staffordshire Geography Exhibition serves to show one of the ways in which we are training the children in England. I am mainly concerned with the method of teaching geography. Most of you gentlemen here, I dare say, are more concerned with results, but should not a pupil, who is going into business on leaving school, have some knowledge of the outside world, and know something of the life work and environment of other peoples? Such an interest is of enormous value because it helps a boy to understand the other man's point of view and in these days who would dare to say that this is not of the first importance to us all, not only because we have to deal with our potential customers, but because we have to deal with our fellow men and women. In short, we have to become citizens of the Empire and citizens of the world. We, in England, still have much to learn. We don't think we know everything, but I sometimes feel that other nations do not know quite so much about our little island as we would wish.

For example, in an American textbook used in the Middle West, this is all that appears about the British Isles. It won't take long to read it: "The British Isles—a small set of islands in Europe. Too large a population. Too great an opinion of themselves and far too big a navy." Of course there is some truth in it.

In passing may I say, and I hope I am not being insular, that many of us in England are beginning to think our navy is not big enough. For, after all, it was the British Navy that made it possible for the nations of our Commonwealth and, indeed, for others as well, to develop along the lines of unrestricted freedom and democratic government during the last century.

(Applause)

In England our educational system is in the process of being overhauled. Some years ago there was published a report called the Haddow Report, which dealt with the education of children up to the age of a little over eleven years. We call it there eleven plus. That dealt primarily with the work of the children in what we call elementary schools which are free and in which the bulk of our children receive their education. Now, in these schools the pupils remain, as I said just now, until they are a little over eleven. Then they have an examination, on the result of which depends their future educational progress. The brighter ones pass to our secondary schools. Those who are not so bright pass to what we call senior schools. In the secondary schools fees are paid. The senior schools are free and in the senior schools training is largely of a practical nature. The boys learn carpentry and in some of the town schools, engineering, and they do remarkably good work. The girls learn cooking and needlework and other subjects of that nature.

Now, in the secondary schools the training is on the whole more academic. Our secondary schools, of course, are based on our old grammar schools, which go back for centuries — several hundred years — and our old grammar schools were originally founded to give instruction in Latin. They were designed for no particular class, but in practice they catered for the children of the wealthier people, or anyway, those fairly comfortably off, and I suppose the ancestors of many of you gentlemen were educated in these old grammar schools.

Now, in addition to these main grammar schools, which serve a restricted area—for instance, one might have a grammar school which would serve a small country town—there are others, called non-local grammar schools, and to these non-local grammar schools boys come from all over the country.

Well, as the years went by these non-local grammar schools developed into what we call our public schools. That is, famous schools, like Winchester and Eton. I often find some confusion among people who don't live in England, over the term "public schools," but in the public schools the education is much the same as it is in the grammar schools, except that these schools, as a rule, cater to boarders and are somewhat more expensive.

Other types of schools grew up side by side with the grammar schools. Such were semi-vocational schools which were established three or four hundred years ago by the sea coast and where, in addition to Latin, the boys were taught the art of navigation and mathematics, so they might become officers in the Navy or the Mercantile Marine.

Then there were the non-Conformist Academies. You know, in England several hundred years ago people who didn't belong to the Church of England suffered many disabilities, so the non-Conformists determined to have schools for their own boys who were sent to these Academies.

So you see our secondary school system is very varied. But, as fees are graduated according to income, the parents of about half the children do not pay any fees and three-quarters come from our state-aided schools.

Now, just before I left England there was published a remarkably able report—the Speno Report on Secondary Education. This report aims at bringing all our secondary schools under one unified system.

It also suggests that there should be established a new type of school, called the Technical High School. Now, in these new schools, boys will be trained for industry and the aim of these schools will be to use industrial training as a foundation for a liberal education. The report also says that more attention should be paid to English and English subjects than is done today. It also suggests that less attention should be given to acquiring facts and more to gaining what one might call experience. In the words of the report, "Education should be thought of in terms of activity and experience, rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts stored."

Well, that sounds attractive, but to my mind, facts must not be neglected, neither must the acquiring of knowledge, for I do think it is important today that our children should have a substantial knowledge on which to base their future life when they go into the world and become citizens. But still the report has been very warmly received in England and it will lay the foundations of educating our children to play their part in a great democratic country for, after all, 20th century education will only be doing its part when it trains our youth not only for the privileges, but also for the duties of the 20th century life.

So I think I may say that in England our outlook has become more and more progressive and that we have gone very far from those days when an old Scottish Head Master of the very conservative type always called the junior members of his staff together at the beginning of each school year and gave them three pieces of advice: "Firstly, ram the facts home. Secondly, see that every boy knows every one of the facts. And, thirdly, whatever you teach, make sure your pupils hate it."

You Canadians and we English share in common our culture and our educational traditions. I should like if possible to see a greater interchange of teachers and professors and also of pupils. I should like to see an extension of that scheme whereby some of our boys pass a year or so in some of your leading schools here, while in exchange Canadian boys pass a year or so in England. I should like also to see more letters interchanged, more correspondence between the children in our schools.

While I am over here I hope I may be instrumental in arranging for this to be done on a larger scale, for all these things foster mutual interest and draw our younger generations together. Have not we, both Canadians and English, the same basic ideals about education? Do we wish our boys to be trained with the one idea of turning them into efficient soldiers or to see little tots running about with rifles or older ones learning to throw hand grenades as part of their physical training? I think not. But we do wish our children to learn to love freedom and, if necessary, to be prepared to defend it and we are determined to educate them for democracy in the highest sense of the word.

(Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Stembridge, on behalf of The Empire Club of Canada and on behalf of the large audience which listens to our proceedings over the air each week, I extend to you a most cordial thanks. It is indeed gratifying to know that the training of Britain's youth is in the peaceful pursuits of such arts as carpentry and engineering and needlework, rather than in military tactics. Again, Sir, I thank you most heartily.

This meeting is adjourned.

"CANADA'S TOURIST INDUSTRY"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. D. LEO DOLAN

Chairman: The President—Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, March 9, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: I rather think that very few people in this Club and perhaps in the whole Dominion realize that the tourist industry is the third largest business in Canada. Today the subject of the tourist industry is to be discussed by Mr. Leo Dolan, Chief of the Travel Bureau of the Department of Transport at Ottawa.

Mr. Dolan was born in New Brunswick. Very early in life he chose the newspaper field as his career. I say very early, because at the age of twenty he was the youngest member of the Press Gallery at Ottawa. In subsequent years he was associated with various newspapers in Canada and eventually was invited to return to his native province to become its Director of Travel and Tourist Business. In 1934, following an enquiry by a Committee of the Senate of Canada, a Travel Bureau was established by the Dominion Government and Mr. Dolan was invited to be its chief. He accepted and as a result of his determined efforts throughout the five years that have intervened, he has built up the tourist industry until it is now the third largest business. Mr. Dolan will speak to us today upon "Canada's Tourist Industry." I have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Leo Dolan. Mr. Dolan. (Applause)

MR. D. LEO DOLAN: Mr. Chairman and Members of The Empire Club: Perhaps my first word to you, Sir, should be my very sincere thanks for the all too flattering introduction which you have seen fit to give me. Newspaper men today are occupying rather an important place, shall I say, in the public eye, and since you have been good enough to make reference to my newspaper career, I hasten at once to tell you I appreciate very much indeed your references to those enjoyable days, when I, too, was a working newspaper man, and before I had, shall I say, degraded into the status of the civil servant at Ottawa. I do want to say this, in my newspaper days when I was a working reporter I came to have a very low opinion of that gentry in your community known as the after-dinner speaker. Since I too, have fallen into that category myself, and having been brought up in a religion where they say that open confession is good for the soul, I must say I have no greater opinion today than when I was forced to listen to their addresses as a newspaper man. In fact, I think I can agree with the dictum set down by one individual: "If all the after dinner speakers in Canada were laid end to end I would leave them there."

May I say, more seriously, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking to this very representative Club of the City of Toronto. The Chairman made me promise I should make that comment before I entered into the subject matter of my address to speak for a very few moments on what has become one of the outstanding industries of the Dominion of Canada, an industry the importance of which is not fully appreciated by the whole people as I would like to see it.

The travel industry—I like to call it that much more than a tourist industry—has become so vital and so important to the economic welfare and progress of the Dominion of Canada that I offer no apology, even to this most representative gathering today, to discuss with you some things which we have done in Canada to create a greater interest in the industry and some things which I hope we will do in the future to bring about a greater promotion and more intense development of this industry.

Perhaps some figures I will give to you today may appear to be astounding. When we talk of the travel industry we must indulge, particularly those of us closely attached to it, in what have been described as astronomical figures. It has become an industry that represents twenty-five per cent of the total exports of the Dominion of Canada. Its monetary value during the last five years has exceeded in value by one hundred per cent the total gold production of this country. In the last ten years, visitors or travellers to Canada have spent within the nine provinces of this country the astounding sum of 2¼ billions of dollars and that amount, I may say to you, has been instrumental in preventing in a large measure a serious financial situation. Even last year, 1938, which was not by any means a peak year in the tourist industry, we saw 269 millions of dollars spent in this country by visitors to the Dominion of Canada, making possible a favourable balance on our international payments—most important to us—a debtor country, of the staggering sum of 149 millions of dollars.

I give these figures to you because I propose today to discuss this travel industry, purely from an economic standpoint and I hope, before I am through, I will be able to submit to you facts and figures that will convince this audience, and those who hear me on the air, that this is an industry which compels the attention of businessmen from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I say it demands the attention of citizens of Canada who desire to see this country make more economic progress than it has within the last number of years.

Within the ordinary course of commerce in the United States, as a striking example, we sell to that country an enormous volume of goods of all kinds, but it is not so widely appreciated, I am sorry to say, that side by side with this commodity export business we also sell to the citizens of the United States another huge bill of goods and services, not itemized in our trade returns. Enormous as are our regular commodity exports in this country, that trade I say now is seriously rivalled in value and volume by the tourist industry of Canada. The records of recent years illustrate this case and show that during the last five years, from 1931 to 1937, inclusive, for every $5.00 worth of goods taken, such as newsprint, farm products and so on, and shipped to the United States in the ordinary course of trade, we sold in addition $4.00 worth of goods and services which make up the purchases of American tourists in this country. For every $5.00 worth of goods, lumber, newsprint, farm products, and so on shipped to the United States in the normal course of trade in the period which I have mentioned, we sold an additional $4.00 worth of goods and services which made up the purchases by American tourists in this country.

I don't think that I could give you any more convincing figures to indicate beyond all doubt the importance of this travel industry to the economic progress and welfare of the whole people of this country. I have said it before, and I repeat today, I don't care whether you are a bondholder or a bootblack, you can't escape receiving benefits from this so-called travel industry in the Dominion of Canada. Some people say it is a mysterious sort of thing. It is nothing of the kind.

Let me for the moment take a tourist party that arrives at the port of Windsor, crosses the international boundary and comes to stay a period of days in the Dominion of Canada. Immediately they arrive in Canada they become members of the consuming population of the Dominion. Very rapidly, in some places more rapidly than others, they become non-resident taxpayers of certain goods and services which we sell to them, and in other provinces, may I say they become very rapidly non-resident taxpayers in the support of the hospitals, et cetera, which take certain taxes on meals and so, first of all the tourist becomes a consumer. He demands goods and services within the country and for that he must pay certain taxes which all of us know. So adding to the consuming population, what does the tourist do? At the very outset he is an asset to the great primary industry of agriculture. In 1929, which was the peak year of our tourist industry, a very estimable economist in this Province—Professor Taylor of McMaster University — estimated that the tourists in Canada consumed 4 million pounds of butter, 18 million pounds of meat and 4 million dozen of eggs, and other farm products in like proportion.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, may I say this to you.

There is no agency or industry within this country that can be so beneficial to the primary industry of agriculture as the so-called travel industry by its greater promotion and development and surely, surely from that standpoint alone, you, who are citizens of this country should bestir yourselves with government agencies, transportation agencies and other agencies, both public and private, endeavouring to develop the industry on strong economic lines.

Secondly, the tourist demands, as I said a moment ago, goods and services. He immediately takes off the relief rolls in certain sections of the country men employed in the travel industry, particularly in the great resort areas of this country. May I for a moment refer to my own province of New Brunswick which gives a striking example of the employment of local labour by non-residents. The Restigouche is a great salmon stream. Some say it is the greatest in the entire world. It was leased by wealthy American people, and with that policy I am in most hearty accord. Had not the river been leased by private enterprise and wealthy Americans it would not today be the great salmon river it is. Along that river hosts of men are employed in the caring for camps, as guides and as outfitters who, without the investment made by outside capital on that stream would today be unemployed and upon the relief of the northern section of the Province of New Brunswick.

Bear in mind another thing in connection with what I call the non-resident tourist and taxpayer. Some of these men and women, too, come year by year, as visitors, desiring recreation and they become within a very short time visitors in the commercial and industrial enterprises of our country. Let me give you one striking example of that in the neighbouring Province of Quebec. Last year, a young man, Mr. Joseph B. Ryan, came into the Laurentian Mountains as a ski enthusiast, in one of the resorts in the great territory north of Montreal. He was delighted with the place. He saw what some of our Canadian visitors had not seen, the great opportunity for the development of a ski resort in the Laurentian Mountains. With what result? To date, Mr. Ryan has invested his own money to the extent of $300,000 in the establishment on Mount Tremblant of one of the finest ski resorts on the North American Continent. It is comparable to the one constructed two years ago by the Union Pacific in Sun Valley which made that resort a great playground for the wealthy people of the United States who are now more than ever indulging in winter sports.

So Mr. Ryan is a striking example of a citizen of the United States who came to play and remained to invest his hard earned cash in a development on Mount Tremblant that will eventually make the Laurentian Mountains the Sun Valley of the eastern portion of this country.

Another factor that I want to talk about today applies particularly to this great Province of Ontario. Personally, I believe we have but scratched the surface of the potentialities in this great travel industry.

I like to tell the story of Maine. Twenty-five years ago Maine was one of the backward states of the Republic. Maine had seen her industry move from that state to more populous centres of the Middle West. She had seen her agricultural industry drop, she had seen her fishing industry going down. Every prosperous industrial and commercial enterprise in that state was on the down grade. But there arose within that state a man of great faith in Maine, a man of tremendous vision and a great courage founded upon that faith and vision—the late Hiram Ricker. He said, "while industries may move, while the agricultural industry may not be prosperous, there is one industry placed here for us by God Himself that can be and should be developed, namely the recreational industry of this state." With what result? Within the last years we have seen Maine rank, one, two, three within the recreational areas of North America—a state with a population even less than the population of the three Maritime Provinces. A tourist industry having a value of 125 million dollars annually. We have seen summer residents in that State, non-resident taxpayers own cottages and summer homes which today have a tax valuation of 50 million dollars.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, without desiring to make odious comparisons, I think I could find one hundred spots in this Province of Ontario comparable of the development which has existed in the State of Maine. The summer resort business in this province could be and should be developed along the same lines which Maine has done, namely the establishment of these cottage colonies in great areas which exist in the northern part of this Province.

There has been development, you may say to me, in Muskoka. Reserves come to my mind like the Temagami. There are countless lakes still unnamed, comparable in every way to any resort area that exists on any part of this North American Continent. There are resorts lying idle, the land held by the municipalities, taken away from the owners because of non-payment of taxes. I say those areas could be developed to bring about in this Province and indeed in other Provinces of Canada, the same condition which exists in Maine and instead of having non-resident taxpayers holding property to the value of 50 millions of dollars in this Province, there is no reason, in my mind, why there shouldn't be established these colony resorts in all the provinces of Canada, with a tax valuation five to ten times greater than now exists. But hand in hand with the development of a colony resort of this kind must go something else, a conservation of the timber resources of this country or, shall I say more properly, the forest wealth of this Province. There must be a conservation of that because without a forest wealth adjacent to these lakes the great charm of the area is gone. The fishing possibilities are lost and the natural beauty of the country is desecrated.

So, I say, hand in hand with the development of this tourist industry must always and ever go a strong programme of conservation of our forest wealth and our natural resources, to maintain the beauty of the country and to maintain the great fishing reserves which exist in this great lakeland province of the Dominion.

Let me give you one or two more figures with respect to Maine. They will give you an idea of the ramifications of this industry. I quote from a report issued by one of the statistical firms, charged with the responsibility of bringing this report to the people in this State. I find in the last year, 1938, approximately 25,000 persons employed in the travel industry earned $7,420,000 in wages alone. About $2,500,000 was spent by summer visitors for farm products and the products of the sea during that same year, repeating in some respects the statement I made to you a while ago as regards the purchases of farm products and products of the sea by visitors who come to Canada.

I would like to see developed in this province of Canada the non-resident summer resort colonies because they become, as I say, non-resident taxpayers and they take up a great slack in our tax burden, so sorely needed in this and other parts of the country.

I want to speak to you for a moment, too, with regard to the changes in connection with this industry during the period of the last twenty-five years. Some twenty-five years ago the railways of this country carried about eighty-five per cent of the tourist traffic of the Dominion of Canada. Today the railways and steamships carry about fifteen per cent of our tourist traffic. The trend in travel has changed. Eighty-five per cent of our traffic comes to this country on rubber wheels and I think it ought to be as plain as a pikestaff, if we are to maintain this type of traffic, if we are not only to advance and expand but hold what we have, it is essential, it is imperative, that governments charged with the responsibility of highway construction shall see to it that our highways are comparable at least, perhaps not necessarily so expensive, to the type of highways the 28 million motorists are enjoying in the country to the south. No tourist area, no country which desires to make its recreational industry a part of its national effort, can hope to expand or improve without a fine system of hard surfaced highways to carry the tremendous motor traffic which is awaiting entry.

There are some 28 million automobiles in the United States. Last year we got something like 3,081,000 motor cars into this country for tourist purposes. There came, as well, 17,048,000 visitors, almost twice the entire population of the Dominion of Canada itself.

I had a letter from a gentleman in this province the other day and he told me he had made a check as he was travelling to his summer home on Georgian Bay and day after day, by check of his own on the highways, he discovered by actual count that sixty per cent of the motor cars he met on the highway bore license plates of the United States. That is indicative, I am sure, of the importance of this motor traffic, the importance, I say, of a system of highways which will be comparable, at least, to that system which they are enjoying in the United States.

I want to say this in Toronto. Ontario has taken the lead in the construction and building of the type of highway which the motorists of the United States desire. This province has built some of the finest highways found on this Continent and its progressive policy in that connection will bring back dividends. I am confident that no money invested by governments will bring back a bigger or a quicker return than the investment which is made on improved highways, to take care of the increasing tourist traffic which is ours for the asking.

There is one other factor I want to speak about. That is in connection with the sports fisherman and the hunter who comes into this country. The sportsman has become and has been for years the de luxe type of tourist who comes to Canada. The figures which are available for a whole year are only of 1937, but they are somewhat enlightening. During 1937 80,380 non-residents came into Canada to hunt and fish in this country and they paid into the Provincial Treasury for merely the right or license to fish a sum of $585,000. That figure is twice as large as the total appropriation, if I may say so, of the Canadian Travel Bureau for any one year of its existence, and that money was spent merely for the right or the license to fish.

I am speaking to an audience that must include a number of sports fishermen and they are going to agree with me, I am sure, in the assertion I propose to make, that the smallest item of expenditure on any successful fishing trip is what you pay for your license. Indeed, there are other necessary attributes to make your trip a success which require the outlay of far more money than the mere payment of a license, which permits you to go to these lakes and rivers and streams and our American visitors, if I may say so, are prolific spenders along that very popular avenue. Last year, I think it is safe to say, about 20 million dollars was spent by non-resident sportsmen in this country.

If we are to maintain this industry, our fish and game industry, I say this in all seriousness, there again must go hand in hand with your tourist promotional work, a fine conservation programme, because in addition to the 80,000 non-residents, some 236,000 residents desire to fish and hunt in this country and they paid $348,000 in licenses, or a total of resident and non-resident sportsmen paid to the provincial treasury, a sum just a little less than one million dollars in 1937.

Let me give the figures for Ontario. I think perhaps they would be most enlightening. This province sold more than 90,000 angling and hunting licenses in the year 1937. The non-resident hunters paid into the Provincial Treasury $92,484 and the non-resident anglers in this province paid to the Provincial Treasury for the right to fish, $330,000 in the year 1937 and so I say again to you, that the non-resident sportsman has become the de luxe tourist of this country, because Canada is the last great fishing and hunting ground left on this continent. As I said a moment ago, it is essential, it is vital that there should be a fine programme of conservation of these great resources, lest we find ourselves in the position of other states to the south of us who years ago boasted the same fishing and hunting resources that we have today and who as a result of no conservation policy, find their lakes and their rivers and streams denuded of fish, and game no longer travel in the forests of that country.

I think efforts have been made and substantially made by provincial authorities to carry on this conservation work, but I say to you, my fellow Canadians, we should always and ever be alert to support those government officials who are endeavouring to maintain the fish and game resources of this country and who look upon those who violate them as in the same category as men who violate any provincial or federal statute upon the law books of this country. There has been too much lethargy, too much inertia with respect to the control of our fish and game laws and particularly to the enforcement of them. There should be, and I plead with you today to support those government officials who are endeavouring to enforce to the limit the fish and game regulations in this or any other province of Canada.

Now, I want to say something else in connection with this industry. Incidentally, perhaps, I should tell you that very, very often we get some humorous letters from the United States, indicative, and I say this without offence, of the ignorance of the people to the south with respect to this country. I had a gentleman write me last year and he said this: "Please tell me what game there is and when there is an open season on it in Ottawa." It required some diplomacy to answer an enquiry of that character, fettered as you are by Civil Service regulations, because, shall I say, one might have gone a little astray and told them of a very popular species of game upon which there seems to be an open season twelve months every year.

Then I had a gentleman who wrote about your own city of Toronto and he said this: "I will be in Toronto on my honeymoon. Where can I fish?"

Very frequently we have had other strange communications. We issued a very fine tourist booklet. Perhaps I shouldn't say that but everybody tells me it is. It is called "Canada Calls You." The other day a letter came from a gentleman in Massachusetts. He said that he had two friends who were going to be married, and would I be good enough to send publications to them. He desired to place both of the booklets among the wedding presents.

Now there is another phase of the tourist industry that I think I should speak of, particularly at a Club of this kind. The great charm of this country is its Canadian and its British atmosphere. The United States citizens who come to Canada desire to find something different than they can find in their own land. Those of us who are charged with the responsibility of advertising this country tell them they can go to a foreign land and find something different by crossing an imaginary line and sometimes they get in here and what do they find? They find some people engaged in catering to tourists are more concerned with Americanizing Canada than they are with maintaining the Canadian, yes, and the British atmosphere of this great country. I detest and I despise those people who think they toady to our American visitors by putting the Stars and Stripes over their hot-dog stands and lodges and cabins. If they must put up a flag, and perhaps they should, I think they ought to have some respect first, for the flag of their own country or Empire and, secondly, they should have some decency and not flaunt the flag of the United States in the eyes of American visitors. They don't appreciate it, they don't want it. Letters in my office tell me they are surprised that such an effort should be made. I had a letter about a year ago from a gentleman who entered the port of Niagara, driving through the Province of Ontario. He had with him his wife and two children, a boy of fourteen and a girl of sixteen. They had passed the Immigration and Customs Officers. They had been driving through the Niagara Peninsula for forty-five minutes when the boy said, "Daddy, when do we get into Canada?" "My dear, you have been in Canada almost an hour." The boy said, "I wouldn't know it, because I have seen the Stars and Stripes more in the last half hour than I saw it all through the State of Michigan." That is not encouraging the foreign British atmosphere. That is not giving an idea of Canadian atmosphere to the visitor.

There is one other matter that I think I should speak of at this point. I suppose Ontario—or should I say Canada?—is the great food basket of this Continent. Yet, you will go into restaurants in this country, you will pick up menus and you will see: Cape Cod Oysters, Idaho Potatoes, Indiana Turnips, New York this, and Chicago that. Dear me! Why can't we present on the tables in our hotels and restaurants typical Canadian food? Why can't we encourage the development of the primary industry of which I spoke a moment ago? Give them fine fish from the Maritimes. Give them fruit from Ontario. (I suppose my friends in the Annapolis Valley won't like that.) Give them fruit from British Columbia. Oysters, if you like, from Prince Edward Island. They have the best oysters in the world. Give them potatoes from this country. Give them distinctly Canadian foods. Inculcate again in their minds by menus (I hope in a more delectable way than in some areas), at least inculcate in their minds that they are in a foreign country, that they are not just travelling in another section of the United States.

Let me read a letter from a young girl, written to me from Massachusetts, written, I may say, to me in my official capacity. She had visited the Province of Ontario and she puts the case in this letter far better than I could do it. Here is what she says, indicative, I think, of the thought in the mind of 95 per cent of the American tourists who come here:

"Wednesday morning we went bravely forth to make our first visit to a foreign country. Did we have difficulty getting through the Customs? No—a lot of fun. The official had an honest-to-goodness waxed moustache. Although he looked frightfully dignified, he forgot his dignity long enough to accept a life saver and kid us about the streets of Boston. Then we drove to a little place called Port Dalhousie. I had always lived on the Atlantic Ocean and I got another big thrill when I saw Lake Ontario. I could have almost believed that some magic had transported us back to Duxbury, Massachusetts, until I tasted that water, it was so difficult to believe that immense body of water could be fresh."

She goes on to tell of her experiences in the shops, the courteous treatment she received, and that she found the prices better than she had expected, far lower, and a better type of merchandise than she got in the United States.

She makes a reference, by the way, to a policeman who met her in St. Catharines, who was so handsome, and didn't seem to mind a bit because she laughed at his helmet and bicycle, but directed her to a good cafeteria.

But she closes with what I think should be of keen interest to every tourist organization in this country. She says: "If you want to make Ontario more interesting I suggest you scatter around a few more wax moustaches and helmets and bicycles. They are so darned interesting to unaccustomed American eyes."

There you have, as I see it, the tenet of a working programme for any tourist organization. Make this country darned interesting to unaccustomed American eyes. Then you maintain, as I say, that atmosphere of Canada, and that atmosphere of the British.

I want to say one other thing and I believe I am through. There is one other matter that I think I should speak to you about in connection with this industry and the possibilities which this incident may bring. This year we Canadian people are to be honoured by a visit of the King and Queen. (Applause) There is no attempt made, I may say, to commercialize the visit from the standpoint of the travel industry. The visit of the King and Queen needs nothing of that character in this country, but as a result of their visit, I think there will come from the United States, as they cross this country, approximately one million visitors during the three weeks in which they are in this country. The arrangements being made are, I think, the most complete ever attempted by a government organization at Ottawa.

They will, I think, give an opportunity, not only for Canadian citizens, but our friends across the border to see royalty. They will give an opportunity, if I may say so, for Canadian people as a whole to demonstrate to the entire world the devotion and loyalty which we as citizens of this Empire have to that gallant young gentleman who sits upon the throne in Britain and his charming Consort, the Queen. (Applause)

In this connection may I say just this. Don't you think it would be a splendid idea if all of us, as Canadian citizens, saw to it that we presented Canada in the most delectable colours, in a most delectable way during the time they are in this country, that there may be an effort put forth by governments, Federal, Provincial and Municipal, to decorate Canada and to present this country in a most appealing manner?

Then again, this visit from the tourist or travel industry standpoint has this great effect. There will be focused upon this country the attention, not only of the entire British Empire but of the people of the entire world, and the attendant results of that visit shall make Canada better known throughout the world than any other incident which has occurred in the history of this country and will give Canada a foremost place, particularly among those who desire to travel for recreation and for education.

I hardly think I need say anything more in that connection, except to repeat again that the arrangements being made, I am sure, will be a credit to this country and a credit to the people who reside therein.

The Chairman was good enough to make reference to the Canadian Travel Bureau and its establishment some four years ago, saying it had been responsible for the improvement in the travel industry in this country. Not wholly. Not, wholly. We have the most splendid co-operation from the railways, from the steamship companies, from the aeroplane and bus organizations. Indeed, I think the establishment of the Canadan Travel Bureau has proved one thing, that when the Canadian people unite on any one project for the development of this country, when there is a unity of opinion with respect to national effort, there are no bounds to the possibilities which may come from that united and that co-ordinated and concerted effort. Everybody in the House of Commons and the Senate, everybody in the transportation business has joined together with the Canadian Travel Bureau—shall I call it the spearhead of the tourist attack?—in endeavouring to improve this industry. When in 1934 the Bureau was established we had seen tourist revenue drop to 117 millions of dollars, and three years after it had increased to 295 millions of dollars, because, as I say, there was a co-ordination of tourist agencies within the country. There was an effort on the part of everybody concerned in the industry to do a real bang-up Canadian job. For that co-operation, for that assistance, for that guidance, in many cases, I today want to publicly thank those organizations and agencies, both public and private, that have assisted the Canadian Travel Bureau.

There are two phases of the tourist industry, Perhaps it is an idealistic phase upon which I want to stay a moment. Then I am through. There is the international aspect of the tourist industry—the urge on the part of the people of the United States to come to Canada to see us as we are, to make it possible for the Canadian people to perform the task which I think we should perform, as part of this Empire, the purveyors of the British viewpoint and the British approach to all questions to our friends across the border, that we may be able to show them that this part of the Empire knows something of that great subject, Democracy; that by the commingling with those people we may present in better terms and in a better way the Empire view on world affairs, the Empire view as it is being carried out by the Government and Downing Street today.

Furthermore, we hear in these thunderous times of the organization of armies, of air forces and we hear of the mechanizing of this, or that or the other great army in countries, particularly, where they have adopted philosophies strange and repugnant to us. Last year

Canada was invaded by the greatest army that ever marched in this or the ages that have gone. It was invaded by an army, 18 million strong, but it was not an army that came in tanks or aeroplanes or in bombers. It was an army that came to us by train, by steamer, by motor car. It was an army that carried upon its banner the word of friendliness; an army that left in its trail goodwill, amity and concord, not desecration or destruction. So this tourist industry from an international standpoint is fostering a greater and better relationship between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. For that, I say it deserves and demands your energetic support as citizens of this Empire and particularly as citizens of this country.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is the national aspect of the tourist industry which is a most important thing, so far as we Canadians are concerned. I say to you I know of no agency that has done more to create a national spirit and a national consciousness in this Dominion than the travel industry. It is my hope that this interchange of ideas, this commingling of people within the Dominion will continue to increase and that by our direct intercommunication we may learn to know better the aims and the aspirations of one another, and that we may become more fully cognizant of our respective positions within the scope of national development. Only as we are loyal and devoted citizens of our own province can we hope or expect to appreciate and sympathize with the desires and aspirations of citizens of communities other than our own, and I believe that the more we travel about this Dominion, the more we can truly appreciate our duties, our responsibilities and our obligations as citizens of the nation we have endeavoured to establish on the northern half of this continent.

So I say to you, give some attention to this travel industry, exert your influence in your own community that its promotion may be more intensive. Endeavour to see it expand. Endeavour to make Canada the great recreational nation on the face of the globe.

(Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Dolan, on behalf of the members of The Empire Club present, as well as on behalf of the large audience that has listened to you over the air, I extend our most sincere and cordial thanks for this most wonderful address. I am sure you have enlightened all of us. If I may say so, I think we can leave it to the Travel Bureau to see that there is a large supply of helmets and bicycles and that an earnest effort is made to encourage the growing of moustaches which can be waxed.

I thank you, Sir, and may I add this: In your reference to the spearhead, I couldn't help but think that the force behind the spearhead is Leo Dolan. Thank you very much, Mr. Dolan.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

BIOGRAPHY — D. LEO DOLAN

Chief, Canadian Travel Bureau, Ottawa

Mr. D. Leo Dolan, Chief of the Canadian Travel Bureau, a recently formed Canadian Government organization, functioning under the Department of Transport, is a newspaperman who, for more than 20 years, has been identified with the press of Canada. He is a native of Fredericton, N.B., and until August of 1934 was Director of Information and Tourist Travel for the New Brunswick Government.

Mr. Dolan is 44 years of age, having started his newspaper career in Fredericton when 15 years of age. He has been on the staff of newspapers in Fredericton, Sydney, Saint John, Regina and Saskatoon, and when but 20 years of age was a member of the Parliamentary Press Gallery of the House of Commons in Canada. At that time he was the youngest member of the press to have been admitted to the House of Commons Press Gallery.

Formerly, Mr. Dolan had been a member of the Press Gallery of the New Brunswick Legislature, the

Nova Scotia Legislature and the Saskatchewan Legislature.

When the Canadian Senate in 1934 conducted the enquiry into the possibilities of the Tourist Industry of Canada, Mr. Dolan was one of the chief witnesses summoned before that committee, under the chairmanship of Hon. W. H. Dennis of Halifax. Following the enquiry the Canadian Government, acting upon the recommendations of the Senate Committee, established the Canadian Travel Bureau to control, promote and develop the Tourist Industry of the Dominion. Mr. Dolan was later appointed Chief of this Bureau by the Federal Government.

In the short space of less than five years Mr. Dolan has accomplished the stupendous task of co-ordinating existing tourist services throughout the far-flung provinces, built up a smooth-working central organization, placed hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of publicity, delivered addresses all over Canada and in the United States in addition to discharging all the other duties that go with selling Canada to the tourist.

"THE IDES OF MARCH"

AN ADDRESS BY GEORGE A. DREW, K.C., M.P.P.

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, March 16, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada, this is going to be an easy task, for I can quickly dispense with the usual words of introduction. I am particularly pleased that I can do so for the reason that I do not know which of the two posts—that now occupied by our speaker, or that formerly held by him as president of The Empire Club—would take precedence. However, I have been asked by Col. Drew to say that he has changed the title of his address, not because he has changed his views, but because he wants to discuss it from a broader angle. He also asks me to assure you that the words he uses in discussing his subject will not give rise to any political discussion. Gentlemen I have great pleasure in calling upon Lieut.-Col. Geo. A. Drew, K.C., M.P.P., former president of this club, and leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in Ontario, to address us. His subject is "The Ides of March."

LIEUT.-COL. GEO. A. DREW: Mr. Chairman and members of The Empire Club, I do appreciate the honor you have done me very sincerely, and the friendship you have shown by the reception you have just given me.

I do not propose to make any attempt to entertain you. I do not propose to try to amuse you, or to make you laugh, for the occurrences of the last thirty-six hours of which I am going to speak must be closer to tears than laughter everywhere in the world. I do not propose to make any pretence at humour, because, although it is the custom of the British to smile in the face of tragedy, the thoughts of every one of us should not only be directed toward the tragedy that is taking place, but toward the future and all that it implies for us.

The title I chose when I was asked to be your guest is indicative of the sudden change that has taken place in a comparatively few days. When I chose the title, "Britain Wins the Second Round," it was perhaps rather like leaving a game with 20 seconds to go, and then finding you had missed the final result. I based my second choice of title on an article by an extremely able commentator on foreign affairs. It is very hard to realize that the article appeared only last week, for it starts with these words: "There will be no Ides of March."

For some months past students of the European situation have been looking forward to the month of March in the fear that during this month some new move would be undertaken by the Axis Powers that would again threaten the peace of Europe as it was threatened a year ago. He would be rash who would venture to prophesy for this month or the months to come for we have seen that the situation can change over night.

The commentator I have quoted wrote that there would be no Ides of March. Gentlemen, these are the Ides of March, and Hitler has marched into the Czech part of Czecho-Slovakia on the anniversary of his march into Austria a year ago. There is about this date, however, something that may offer hope.

You will remember that it was at the height of Caesar's power; when, by unscrupulous use of the Roman legions, he had subjugated a vast territory, that a soothsayer said to him: "Beware the Ides of March." While I hesitate to prophesy, I can express the hope that the Ides of March may be just as disastrous for this new and crueller Caesar, this man who has jettisoned international honour, this man who has disregarded everything that resembles international decency.

Munich was a bitter pill for every one of us to swallow, but it did offer hopes. There were reasons to believe that Munich might be the basis which would give Europe the opportunity for a return to sanity, and also that in due course of time Germany might take care of its own madman. Unfortunately another six months have passed and that has not been achieved. Instead, all hopes of Munich were shattered beyond repair yesterday. But I refuse to believe that because of what has happened in the last thirty-six hours, we should jump rashly to the conclusion that the stand taken by Britain and France at Munich last September was wrong. Weak though the arguments of Germany were; completely lacking in justification as they certainly were, there was, nevertheless, some ground for their claim that they were only seeking the union of the German speaking people of Europe in one greater Reich. After all, whether it was or was not justified we had been warned that that was their intention. You may remember that at Berchtesgaden, Godesburg, and then at Munich itself when we thought we were on the brink of war, Hitler emphasized the point that all Germany wanted was the incorporation within the Reich of those people of German race living in the Sudeten territory because they wanted to be part of Germany, and their right to self-determination should not be denied.

There was another reason why it was difficult for Chamberlain and Daladier to take the stand they might otherwise have taken, and that was that Chamberlain had sent Lord Runciman to Czecho-Slovakia. He was a man with a keen, clear and judicial mind, and whether he was right or wrong, the fact remains that Runciman reported that the Sudeten territory which comprised people of German origin should not be deprived of its right to decide whether it would join with Germany or not.

In the face of that recommendation it was difficult for Chamberlain and Daladier to follow any other course than they did. I believed, and still implicitly believe, that although Chamberlain and Daladier knew they were dealing with a madman, they thought they were dealing with a madman whose course was fixed, and whose particular form of insanity had been disclosed in his own book, Mein Kampf. In Mein Kampf, Hitler had laid down in clear words exactly what it was that he thought the German people should have, and you must remember that long before Mein Kampf was written, the Nazi party had laid down the programme of twenty-five points that is still its its programme today. And the first point of that programme, the point they have always emphasized as the predominant feature, was the incorporation of all German speaking people in Europe into one greater Reich.

It was possible to say exactly what they meant by that, because beside the shrine of the Nazi faith in Germany, the memorial to those men who died in the first putsch there were the names of the territories that Hitler had promised to incorporate in a greater Germany. Those names were clear, and when one looked on those names and the wreaths that were over them, never to be removed till those territories became part of Germany, one could have no doubt about the intention of the Nazi party in regard to Sudeten-Deutschland, Memel, Danzig, Schleswig-Holstein and other territories that included German speaking people. Therefore nobody should have been surprised by the Austrian coup, or the Sudeten occupation because of the perfectly clear declaration of what they proposed to do as soon as they had the power to do it.

The whole method and intention is clearly defined in Mein Kampf—it is a book that should be read and studied by all—and Hitler first of all stated that there was no use talking about what they wanted, no use telling the rest of Europe about their demands. Their first step was to increase their power till they could take what they wanted whether the rest of the world wished it or not. He said, further that they should make no demands till they were ready to enforce them, and then they must go out and take what they wanted. A simple doctrine, gentlemen; the doctrine of Genghis Khan.

But the difficulty we face now is this. We cannot know what the discussions were at Munich. We cannot know all the considerations before them at that time. But the fact remains that Hitler, speaking on behalf of Germany, said that if the Sudeten German areas were ceded they had no further aspirations against the rest of Czecho-Slovakia and would co-operate in preserving its boundaries. True there are those who contend that Chamberlain and Daladier were wrong to try the policy of appeasement with this man, but whether they were right or wrong, Chamberlain and Daladier did not know that they were dealing with a lying gangster.

Gentlemen, yesterday morning the Al Capone of international relations not only tore up every international agreement signed with his country but he announced to the whole world that no longer, so far as Germany was concerned, would any argument or any question of international decency have any effect. That, gentlemen, is the situation that we face, and it is a situation which Canadians must consider very gravely.

Today it broke. This morning Hitler made his first speech in Czecho-Slovakia—in ancient Bohemia—and he had the effrontery to tell its people and the world that they were not being taken arbitrarily under the control of the German people but that they had been part of Germany for the last thousand years. They had been torn away, and Germany could not tolerate that situation.

The man is mad, of course he is mad, but not one of us has lived before in a period of history when there was no pretence at least on the part of the head of a great state that he should even recognize the truth. Bohemia was never German. It is a country with a culture far more ancient than that of Prussia. Bohemia was perhaps one of the loveliest spots in Europe until its people were taken into slavery yesterday. The people of that territory were as cultured, as capable, as honourable, as decent and as liberty loving as any in the world.

Most of you saw in this hotel, speaking to this club a few weeks ago a representative of the Czech people—Jan Masaryk, and I thought his speech was so moving as to bring tears to one's eyes. Here was a man whose father had created the nation which was founded on the ancient culture of the Czechs and Slovaks, a nation which I can say from what I saw in Czecho-Slovakia, had worked out one of the finest forms of democracy in the whole world.

What must these men think today, these men like Benes and Masaryk who had seen their nation freed from those who held it in despotic control and given an opportunity to become a first rate democratic power. And now it is again in slavery. In this case there is none of the pretence of a year ago when Hitler marched into Austria. Here there was no pretence of an argument that Germans were menaced and Hitler was their liberator. The situations are entirely different. There was in Austria a very strong pro-German feeling because they were all German speaking people. When I was there a year and a half ago I was convinced that possibly a majority of the Austrian people were in favour of the union with the Reich. It was probably very close, but we must remember that only a few years before Austria had herself proposed the Anschluss because of the truly intolerable position their country was in. I believe a measurable majority of these people wanted union, and because of the propaganda that had taken place, it is also true that a majority of the Germans in the Sudeten wanted union. Please understand me, I am not attempting to justify either of these annexations, I am simply pointing out that because of propaganda, in the case of Henlein particularly, there had been created some demand for union with Germany.

Today, however, we have an entirely different situation. Never have I seen in any nation hatred so intense as that of the Czechs of Prague for Germany. And today Hitler is in the ancient castle of Hradcany on the hill above Prague, the castle that has ruled Bohemia for a thousand years. In this case he has taken under German control people, who, almost without exception, hate him and the form of government he represents.

I say, without any reservation at all, that yesterday was one of the turning points in the world's history. Until yesterday morning people could argue that we found in the Nazi programme and in Mein Kampf a clear statement of the German desire to have incorporated in one nation all people of German speech and race, and the return of the colonies they lost in the war, but that they had no intention of going beyond that. Now we know that there is no limit to the extent of German expansion except the limit of German desire, and you and I must consider what the impact of that may be upon ourselves. A cruel Sadist is at the head of an increasingly powerful nation, but when we recognize that we should not forget, it would be very unwise to forget, that Hitler and Nazism are not yet representative of Germany as a whole, and I do not believe they ever will be. We cannot forget these people have given to the world music, literature, art and philosophy, and I cannot believe that the spirit is dead which created this contribution to mankind. And when you think of Germany, when you think of the physical Germany, what comes to your mind is the thought of the tidy attractive homes in the cities and in the country. What comes to your mind is a recollection of the real country, the beautiful scenery of Bavaria, the simple wholesome family life of a people who, unfortunately for the moment are living under this accursed Nazi doctrine.

That doctrine has now been imposed on another people. There are few parallels in history for what happened yesterday. Only this morning an order was proclaimed throughout Czecho-Slovakia that all Jews owning or in charge of businesses must arrange to transfer those businesses to some trustee who is not Jewish by midnight tonight. No, there is no parallel to that. It is slavery of the worst type, and particularly as it applies to the Jews in Prague for Prague is one of the finest and most advanced communities in the whole world, with a culture that goes back for many hundreds of years. I visited the Jewish Cemetery there and in it I saw tombstones dating back to the sixth or seventh centuries. That measures the age of their civilization and culture in this old capital of Bohemia. And these people who have contributed so much to that splendid country are told they must give up everything they have created by midnight tonight.

Surely that must be a warning to the whole world. I think that the situation today is far more serious than at the opening of the Great War in 1914. Then the issue was one that involved national freedom of action. Today the issue involves the very survival of civilization itself.

What is the use talking about the possibility of war, and asking what we shall do if war is declared. War has been declared. We are at war now. No shot has been fired, and please God, no shot may be. None the less we are at war, and that war is going to determine whether civilization or barbarism is going to predominate. Hitler declared war a year ago yesterday when he marched into Austria. That war continued and six months later he added the Sudeten territories to the Reich. Yesterday he added a still greater territory in that same war. Admittedly it is war with a different mechanism—a war of blackmail—but it is war just the same. He told the Austrians they must submit without fighting or be obliterated from the air. It was an appalling choice to have to make—to give up their freedom or be utterly destroyed. Those were the only alternatives. They submitted.

Then, last September, the Government of Prague was told that unless they submitted they would be obliterated by bombs, and with that terror before their eyes they had little choice. Now the same mechanism is repeated.

It is war by blackmail, and, gentlemen, we must fight in that war, and it is still possible to fight without a shot being fired but the only way we can fight successfully is to accept the gauge of battle now. If they are going to carry on this war of blackmail we also can fight a war of different mechanism, and we can carry on such a war as long as we wish. To do it we must get all the democratic nations to stand together and say: So long as you continue we will not trade with you in any way. Unless Germany can get the things that the democratic nations now have—metals, oil and other raw materials—they cannot fight a war, and why should we give them the means to fight a war to break down the civilization we wish to preserve.

I believe Canada is faced with one of the greatest crises in Canadian history. Canada should decide now that not one thing will go from Canada with which Germany can fight a war. And when we say that we should say to Germany as well that we have no hatred of the German people, millions of whom are as peace loving as we are ourselves.

There is discontent in Germany. Only a couple of weeks ago Goebbels talked to the nation by radio, and criticized those Germans who were complaining, and if Goebbels is so worried that he must go on the air to protest, the discontent in Germany must be very serious indeed.

Don't let anyone say: "Well, it is a strange way to show your friendship to the German people if you refuse to send them what they need to eat." The only way we can tell these people how much we hate the system of government which they tolerate is to tell them that if they want our friendship, if they want the things we have, and the things they need, they must get rid of that system.

We must look to the future.

Only last week one of the most responsible papers in Europe—the Journal des Debats, of Paris, a great newspaper—came out with the statement that they had conclusive evidence of the plans of the Axis powers for the coming year. They made a statement last week which unfortunately was not recognized as being of much importance. They said there would be a sudden surprise move of conquest, and that the plan was to follow that up by increasing pressure on the democratic powers at various points with the aim of world domination by the Axis powers. How far are we away from that? The taking of Hainan was part of that plan. And is Mussolini, who has supported Hitler so strongly, going to sit still while Hitler absorbs the rest of Europe and get nothing for himself? The Italian people, if they believe his promises, may turn to demanding something from him. Those three powers of the axis—Germany, Italy and Japan—if they work together at the present time and can lull the fears of the democracies about their future course, will come very close to dominating temporarily the world situation. The only thing that will stop it is unreserved and unrelenting action on the part of the democratic powers to preserve freedom. The only answer they will understand is another three-power pact just as real and just as vigorous—a London, Paris, Washington axis. Their dream is world dominion—world dominion with tyranny—and the only way we can meet it is by a world organization for the preservation of freedom, justice and decency.

And we must take our part if we are to be worthy of any consideration in the Empire and the world. We should take to heart the statement that DeValera made to the Irish parliament a few weeks ago. In effect he was asked what the position of Ireland would be if Great Britain went to war. Few would ever accuse DeValera of loving Britain, but you will remember what his answer was. You will remember his answer because of its implications for Canada. He said: "If Britain is at war, Ireland is at war at the same time." He explained why he said it. He explained that the whole economic structure of Ireland was built up on the basis of continued trade and exports to Britain, and if Ireland were to continue to exist she must carry on that trade even with Britain at war. Ireland, therefore, would be considered a hostile nation by the enemies of Britain unless they gave up that trade, and this they could not do.

Is there any possibility that we should refuse to give her any help that was in our power, that we would refuse to send her any goods she might need? Never. And if we ship goods to Britain, any nation seeing those goods going from Canada will consider us a hostile power. This is not Imperialism in the narrow sense of the term. It is simply a common sense recognition that we are part of the British Empire.

Gentlemen, we are facing the greatest crisis since

Canada became a nation, and in facing this crisis there are certain essential things we must remember. Whatever may have been our need two days ago there are four things that are vital to us today. They are: first, national unity; second, a clear national policy; third, an understandable Empire policy; and fourth, a foreign policy for the whole Empire.

Gentlemen, I will repeat them to you because they are vital to the survival of Canada as a nation. We must have national unity, a clear national policy, an understandable Empire policy, a foreign policy for the whole Empire. In addition to understanding these policies we must be prepared to stand behind them. I am not going to define any one of them. They must be defined by those who have the responsibility of putting them into effect. When I speak of an understandable Empire policy, I simply mean some definite statement as to where Canada stands in relation to the Empire.

And the time has come, I think, under pressure of this crisis, to re-create the old Empire Cabinet so that we can never say that anything is being done by Great Britain with which we are not acquainted. Such a move would give the whole Empire new vigour, courage and hope—and there still is hope that sanity can be restored.

We are part of a world in which we must play our part if we are to survive as a nation. A house divided against itself cannot stand. A divided Empire will mean the loss of our own sovereignty. I do urge that every one of us work, as we never worked before, for the unity of all the democratic powers, and particularly for the unity and co-operation of those people who have the same background—the people of the British Empire and the United States. That, I suggest, offers our only hope of peace.

And our part in Canada, gentlemen, is to work with all the vigour we possess for a truly united Canada within a united British Empire.

(As Col. Drew sat down there was prolonged applause followed by three cheers and a tiger for him.)

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Drew, I am not going to utter one single word of thanks. These cheers speak for themselves and for the men who have listened to you.

Gentlemen, the meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX, B.A., M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, March 23, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Today we have the privilege of listening to another prominent resident of the Province of Ontario in the person of Dr. William Sherwood Fox, B.A., M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.C., who is best known to all of us as President of the University of Western Ontario at London. Dr. Fox was educated in the schools of Toronto and at McMaster University. Following graduation he went to the United States and was on the teaching staff of such outstanding Universities as Johns Hopkins and Princeton. He returned to Canada and joined the staff of the Western University—as it was at that time—and he rose step by step until he is now President and Vice-Chancellor.

Naturally, with that background, Dr. Fox's writings and addresses have been of a classical nature, but since his taking over the administrative duties of the University he has not had the time that he formerly had to devote to those pursuits, so he has taken up the study of natural history and I believe is known somewhat as an amateur botanist and a famous angler. He asked me to go very easy in introducing him and not to refer to the size of fish which he catches or those he does not catch. However, the subject which Dr. Fox is to discuss today is one of interest to all of us in this section of Ontario, particularly to that group who have been making a study of conditions in the Township of King, in this county. Dr. Fox has had a splendid opportunity for close study and examination of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority and that is the subject he will discuss today. I have indeed great pleasure in introducing Dr. William Sherwood Fox. His topic will be "A Great Experiment in Applied Democracy."

(Applause)

DR. WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I am very gratified indeed to get this cordial welcome to The Empire Club. I am also gratified to have the honour of addressing your Club a second time. The invitation seems to be an assurance that my former address was at least not especially terrifying. However, the Club may be wondering, even after the President's introduction of me, just what authority I have for speaking on the subject on which I am to speak today. I may reply as I replied to the criticism of a friend directed at me two years ago when I was about to speak upon Ireland. This friend, a clergyman, with a great penchant for preciseness, said to me, "Fox, you haven't seen enough of Ireland to be competent to speak about it." "Hold a moment," I said; "My good friend, have you not announced that next Sunday you propose to speak on hell? Have you ever been there? I have at least been to Ireland." May I add for your reassurance, Mr. President and Gentlemen, at least I have visited a number of the works of the Tennessee Valley Authority under the personal tutelage of its Chairman.

The wording of my title is deliberately chosen. Personally, I believe that the real principles of democracy have in recent years been obscured by a barrage of words about democracy. The fact that these words have been well meant has not lessened their ill effects. When the people have cried for the bread of democracy they have been given definitions and dissertations. The time has come to study democracy in terms of concrete examples of its successful application. The Tennessee Valley Authority is itself one such example which has already attained some striking results. Surely such an epochal enterprise carried on at Canada's very doors, an enterprise laden with a multitude of lessons, both negative and positive, should not be overlooked by Canadians. For me the TVA drives home one great inclusive lesson in particular: that no policy of government is genuinely democratic unless it brings to the individual common citizen substantial benefits which he can enjoy at his own hearth. The fact that a distinguished Canadian, Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan, is Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority should enhance our interest in that great work. His personal desire that Canadians learn something concerning the TVA is in large part the reason why I am addressing you upon the TVA today. My remarks are authoritatively based upon the material with which he has supplied me and upon things I have myself seen in the Valley. May I add that the name of Morgan adds still further lustre to the name of Strathroy, the home of great Canadians—the Honourable Edward Blake, Sir George Ross, Sir Arthur Currie, Professor James Shotwell?

I take it for granted that the members of this Club desire to review the TVA with open minds, that is, to view it as a whole and stripped of the many controversial issues that have obscured its purposes and achievements.

Certainly, one would expect Canadians to be quite unlike the incurably prejudiced Southern professor who warned his students against Garrison's anti-slavery paper, the Liberator: "I warn you, gentlemen, against the detestable, dangerous doctrines of The Liberator, of which, thank God, I have never seen a copy."

Happily, the TVA's issue with the Utilities has been satisfactorily settled. The recent congressional investigation has, in the eyes of the nation at large, vindicated the present Chairman of the Commission. Moreover, to decide these issues, which after all are only secondary, is none of our Canadian business.

The TVA was established by Act of Congress in 1933. It began operating immediately under an administrative Commission of three men—Arthur Morgan (Chairman) Engineer and President of Antioch College; Harcourt A. Morgan, formerly President of the University of Tennessee; and David Lilienthal, a very gifted young lawyer with a broad practical experience in public affairs on a large scale. May I refer you to the September, 1938, issue of Harper's Magazine, and to the article that number contains, entitled, "Morgan, Morgan and Lilienthal."

In 1938 Harcourt Morgan succeeded Arthur Morgan in the Chairmanship. The Act establishing the TVA secured national support because of the national significance of its chief aim—the provision of a measure of effective control over the floods of the Mississippi River. This primary aim must not be lost sight of, for it is essential.

But in order to control waters flowing down the Mississippi the system of control must be pushed back to the ultimate sources of the waters—back into the tributaries of the Mississippi, back into *their* tributaries, the smaller rivers, creeks, brooks and springs; back into the fields, forests, valley slopes, and upper hill country where the rains fall; back to man's treatment of the soil; and, finally, back to the life of man in the Mississippi Valley and to the conditions under which he lives it. What a colossal programme! It involves the study and treatment of the natural resources and the civilization of the whole Mississippi Valley. On that scale an impossible undertaking at a single stroke. However, in order to reduce the scale to a practicable basis a regional unit of the Mississippi Basin was selected, namely, the Tennessee Valley.

In fact, history authorizes one to say that the selection was really made over a hundred years ago in the time of President Munro. In recent times Senator Morrill, Senator Norris and the Roosevelt Government are but carrying out the accumulated judgments of several generations of predecessors.

It is quite easy to get a picture of the Tennessee Valley because its boundaries are sharply defined. This region, significantly situated close to the geographical centre of the United States covers 42,000 square miles, i.e. 26,000,000 acres. It comprises seven States, including all of one State and parts of others: Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. It has a population of two and one half millions, while the total population of the seven states is seventeen millions. It is sharply bounded by winding summit-lines of hills and mountains reaching as far east as the western parts of Virgina and North Carolina. The mountains on either side in this eastern section range in altitude from 5,000 to 6,500 feet. This great valley region has, with the single exception of the northwest corner of the United States, the highest rainfall in the whole country. It ranges between 80 inches a year in the Smoky Mountains and 40 in the lower reaches of the Valley—an average of 52 inches a year. The volume of water thus contributing to a Mississippi flood involves almost astronomical figures. One inch of rain falling on an acre weighs 113 tons; 52 inches of rain means 6,000 tons per acre. On 26 million acres the annual rainfall would weigh 156,000,000,000 tons. Now, bear in mind that this inconceivably vast volume of water drops in its course from an extreme of 6,500 feet above sea level to about 350 feet at the Tennessee's junction with the Ohio. The Tennessee alone from Knoxville to its mouth at Paducah, Kentucky, is 650 miles in length and has a total vertical drop of approximately 500 feet. Think of the enormous latent power involved, power nearly all of which has in the past gone to waste.

But a point or two more must not be overlooked. The climate shades from that of our own Southern Ontario to that of the hot cotton-growing south. Nature has endowed the area with almost a full range of supplementary resources needed for a great modern civilization. In it or on its very borders are coal, high-grade clays, lead, iron, potassium, manganese, and of greatest importance for an agricultural tract, a large deposit of phosphate ore. In this area rural life and urban life exist in a natural interlocking relationship to each other. No huge cities have yet developed. Urban life still has its roots in the agriculture of the region. Only about 25 per cent of the two and a half millions live in cities.

Even this thumb-nail sketch explains satisfactorily the reason for selecting the Tennessee Valley for a great regional experiment. But there still remains a more cogent reason, a great twofold one: it was selected first because its resources have been terribly impaired through the carelessness and improvidence of man; secondly, because it is still possible to retrieve a large measure of these resources and to remedy some of the damage done. It is a sad fact that this beautiful, rich Valley of the Tennessee is now after scarcely more than a century's occupation a region of conspicuous human distress on a large scale. Erosion has eaten away seven million acres of farm lands and left them stripped to the sterile sub-soil or pitifully gullied. They are a sorry, disheartening sight, as I can say from recent observation. Stupid methods of agriculture and the usual prodigality of the pioneer account for much of this condition. Most of the people realize the seriousness of the situation, but ignorance, inertia, sheer bewilderment and superstition have stifled most efforts to seek and apply remedies. Many of the rural people regard the erosion of their hillsides as "an act of God" concerning which nothing can be done without going against the Bible. The inexorable cycle of impoverishment has done its work and done it thoroughly. People have felt themselves helpless before the condition. The municipality, the county, even the state, as separate units, can do nothing, because there are so many interlocking regional factors that are outside the jurisdiction and control of each of these governmental units. Successful handling of the situation is plainly a matter for the Federal Government, since the Federal Government alone is in a position to co-ordinate the many tasks involved.

The aims of the TVA may conveniently be reduced to five. In setting them forth I draw freely from Chairman Harcourt Morgan's statement submitted to the first Congressional Committee of Investigation in 1934. The first aim is to aid in controlling floods in the Mississippi. This aim, entirely apart from all the other aims, is of such momentous importance that it would have been sufficient of itself to set the Tennessee Valley Authority enterprise in motion sooner or later. It would seem to be simple logic to conclude that control of a great tributary like the Tennessee would have an appreciable effect upon the Mississippi. At all events that belief prompted the United States Government to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority. Already there is definite proof of the soundness of the policy. In 1937 the few dams then constructed on the Tennessee accounted for a lowering of six inches in the flood crest at Cairo, Illinois. An infinitesimal difference, you say. Nevertheless, it meant the saving of Cairo and of many other cities farther down stream. This augurs well for the success of the completed system of control dams. Engineers predict a lowering of the crest by two feet, a success sufficient in itself to warrant all the expense involved.

The second aim flows naturally from the first, namely, the establishment and maintenance of improved navigation on the Tennessee River. The series of flood-control dams provides for navigation at no additional expenditure except for that involved in the construction of locks. The TVA can provide for a nine-foot channel for the 650 miles between Knoxville and Paducah. "When completed," says Dr. Morgan, "this development on the Tennessee will tie directly into the national interior waterways system, which will then constitute perhaps the largest improved internal waterway in the world." Can we Canadians not see the plain implication? This will bind together commercially the consuming north with the products of the central south, rich in cotton, tobacco, corn, and certain important regional commodities. Conversely, it will bind the processing north with the south and its need of finished goods. This aim is, in fact, part of a plan originating in 1824 when John C. Calhoun recommended it to President Munroe.

The third aim is the conservation of the soil and of fertility. This aim though put third in order really ranks higher in ultimate importance. In fact, it is an inseparable part of the first aim. Manifestly, dams by themselves are not a sufficient check upon the run of water down a watershed: one has to go back to the very sources of the water, to the rain itself as it falls upon the land. Since the sides of the Tennessee basin are sloping, many of them even steep, the rain literally runs off the land. When it runs off it carries away with it tons of soil and cuts great gashes deep down into the infertile subsoil. Something has to be done to make the rain "walk off," or, better still, soak into the land. If this is done a number of benefits are gained at once—floods are either stopped or lessened, and the land is improved in productiveness.

As the Tennessee Valley Authority viewed this phase of its problem its leaders saw that something more had to be done than merely hold the fertility that still remained in the soil: an effort was needed to put back into the soil as much as possible of the fertility that had already been drawn from it and lost. Of the elements that had become deficient there were two outstanding ones — nitrogen and phosphorus. Providentially, Nature has made it quite easy to supply these: the nitrogen could be restored through the cultivation of leguminous plants, whereas the phosphorus in suitable form could be prepared through the waterpower already being generated at Muscle Shoals. A large deposit of low grade phosphorus ore lies near the Shoals. This, though not inexhaustible, is at least ample to permit a long-term experiment in training agriculturists how to use phosphorus and other mineral fertilizers properly and systematically. Of the soundness of this aim nobody with any vision at all has ever entertained any doubt. Nevertheless, it is by far the most difficult aim of all to attain, since its success depends, first, upon convincing individual farmers that the job can be done, and, next, upon securing their consent to try to do it. Complete success would involve the persuasion of 75 per cent of two and a half million people to adopt new views and ways of farming. To anyone who knows the intense individuality of the Tennessee Valley farmers and hillbillies, the task would seem to be as difficult as that of making Niagara Falls flow uphill. However, anyone who has had to do with large bodies of people knows that good initial success with a relatively small proportion will in the end affect the whole group as by a beneficent contagion. As a matter of fact, the process of contagion is going on at the present time. Presently I shall have a few words to say about it. It is in this feature of the TVA programme that the genuine democratic quality of the enterprise becomes manifest.

The fourth aim is to distribute widely the hydroelectric power developed at dams on the Tennessee and its leading tributaries, e.g. the Clinch and the Hiwassee. Note that I did not say the production of hydro-electric power. Manifestly, the power is a by-product of the primary aim, flood control. The dams in holding back the water thereby store latent power. The water belongs to the people and likewise the reserve of power. It seems to be the business of the people's government to see to it that the people have the opportunity to make use of this power, and that is just what the Federal Government has done through the TVA. But since the Authority is not a retailer, it can sell only to groups of citizens—municipalities, communities, utility companies. These in their turn retail the power to the individual consumer. Naturally, the Authority develops the power at low cost and therefore can distribute it at a low price. Quite logically, it exacts of the community groups or corporations that they sell to the ultimate consumer at a correspondingly low price. In a word, it is the duty of the TVA to see that the people get the full benefit of what is their own. On sound business grounds the Authority is required to use the proceeds from its wholesale distribution, "so far as may be practicable to assist in liquidating the cost or aiding in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority."

It requires no cleverness to see the possibility of conflict between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Utilities. The Utilities have said that the Government, through the Authority, is competing with private business. The Authority says, no, it is only co-operating with the Utilities and helping them and at the same time bringing great new advantages to millions of people and raising their standard of living. The Utilities have said that the Authority's famous "yardstick" for ascertaining the selling price of electricity is unsound. The Authority emphatically denies the charge. Fortunately, the recent purchase of the privately owned Tennessee utilities by the Authority has brought this controversy to an end.

The fifth aim relates to a large-scale provision for national defence, and this aim is generally lost sight of amid the controversies that have taken place. During the Great War the Government developed the power of the Tennessee at Muscle Shoals in order to produce in vast quantities the chemicals needed in warfare. Although at the present time the plant is used to produce phosphates for fertilizer, it is held as a stand-by for war purposes. Even a blind man can see the strategic defensive importance of the Tennessee Valley, far removed as it is from the threat of invasion and attack.

Chairman Harcourt Morgan appends a sixth aim which is really a summary of all the other aims. It is that the unified attack upon all the fundamental problems involved may "lay the basis for reversing the inevitable trend toward impoverishment in this southeastern region," a trend that has been going on since the Civil War.

". . . I cannot believe," he says, most significantly, "that the gradual depletion of any section of the nation can be other than a cancerous growth which must affect adversely the entire national well-being. The loss of a national market and the growing burden of relief are obvious effects. But the real tragedy is the human one. It is the fact of degrading poverty in contrast to the potentiality of plenty."

Certain hasty charges have been made against the TVA. One is that the Authority duplicates existing agencies. The fact is that on the contrary it employs them and co-ordinates them, as I shall show shortly. It works closely with the appropriate Federal agencies as well as with the appropriate agencies of the seven Valley States and of their counties, in such fields as public health, education, navigation, agriculture, reforestation, distribution and use of electric power and so forth. It is through the representatives of these agencies that the TVA reaches down to the common man in his own home. This procedure is what the Chairman calls the TVA's principle of "energizing at the grass roots"; in short, it is democracy at work. The people thus energized to co-operative effort find all these agencies to be high roads leading straight to the advantages provided for the people by the great Bureaus at Washington, the seven State Capitols, and the State Colleges and Universities.

Again, the TVA has been charged with being a political organization. The truth is that from the founding of the Authority the Management and Staff from top to bottom have been appointed on merit alone. An abler lot of officers and helpers I have never seen anywhere in any organization. At first, people took it for granted that the Authority was just one more big machine for placing political friends in earning posts. But through numerous failures to secure jobs by political influence the citizens have at last learned to cease bothering the Authority. Long may it succeed in this exemplary course!

The so-called "interests" have not been the sole opponents of the TVA. Probably the stubbornest are the small farmers and hillbillies who are perhaps the most individualistic inhabitants of North America. From the start the Authority collided with them in its endeavour to purchase vast acreages of farm and forest. Since many of these people can neither read nor write they have to be handled most tactfully. Many amusing tales are told of the experiences of purchasing agents. One old man, according to Russell Porter, insisted on sufficient time to read a document. "I don't sign nothin' till I've read it with my own eyes," he said. After "studying" it for five minutes without realizing it was upside down, he made his mark, explaining that he could not write his name because of the cramps that he had in his arm that day.

Now, how does the TVA reach down to the individual citizen with its beneficent influence? I can offer only two pointed illustrations here.

The initial step in rural social improvement is the demonstration farm. In order to start such a farm the county agricultural representative calls a meeting of the farmers of his district. Together they select certain farms and farmers for the experiment. To the farmers chosen the TVA gives free supplies of super phosphate fertilizer produced at the Muscle Shoals plant. In their use of these they pledge themselves to follow the directions of the TVA experts and other accredited agents. A study is made of all the conditions prevailing in the several farms concerned. According to the findings the farmers change their methods of tillage, adopt various appropriate means to check the gullying of their lands, alter or rotate or diversify their crops, which are suitably treated with the fertilizer provided. The final results in each year are watched by all the other farmers in the country. Invariably success has induced many of them to imitate the procedure. The occurrence of this year after year is extending with increasing momentum the movement toward better farming in the Tennessee Valley.

One of the greatest needs is that of reducing drastically the row crops such as cotton and corn, since these always expose the soil to erosion. They require to be replaced by such cover crops as hold the soil and at the same time impregnate it with nitrogen. Again, where row crops are retained the land must be worked by contour terraces of varying widths. Such a treatment as this delays or even may entirely stop the water in its run off the surface of the land. Study has revealed that under certain conditions a combination of cover and row crops appears to be desirable. But, unfortunately, there has been no implement in existence possessing the two qualifications of capacity to do the work and of being sold at a price within the reach of the low income farmer. And one must remember that the average rural income of the area is appallingly low.

At this point appears the co-operative service of an established agency. The problem devising a suitable implement is given to the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Tennessee. In due time the engineers submit a design to an implement manufacturing company. "It will cost a hundred dollars per machine," says the company. "No good," retorts the engineer; "the poor farmer cannot pay a cent more than $20.00." Back and forth goes the exchange of arguments till at last one of the great factories turns out an implement to retail at $22.50. It is successful and is now on the market. This machine makes possible what is called "corrugated farming." By this method grain can be easily sown in furrows cut through a matted cover crop. The method costs less than the ordinary method of preparing the land and of seeding, and at the same time conserves the soil and its fertility. Moreover, it raises the farmer's income, enhances his standard of living, absorbs the rain, keeps his farm from migrating to the Gulf of Mexico, and in proportionate degree it aids in lessening the volume of flood waters each year.

Another illustration may be cited. The TVA holds in trust for the people, as we have said, its by-product of electric power. The people who need it most are the poor of the rural districts. But as individuals they cannot get the power for use, and for very obvious reasons: they lack the means to purchase both the power and the articles of electrical equipment, and, besides, the TVA is not a retailer. However, the TVA says to a group of neighbours: "Combine together for an experiment in the use of electric power. Start with an experiment in community refrigeration." They agree to make an attempt but find that the cost of any existing make of refrigerator is quite beyond their financial resources. Again, an appeal is made to an existing agency. The Agricultural Extension Service of the University is asked to devise a refrigerator that will be large enough to serve the community and at the same time can be sold at a price the community can afford. The result is the production of a substantial inexpensive "walk-in" cooler. The essential parts are now made by the large refrigeration firms; these may be assembled and put together by the village carpenter, and the total cost of this "walk-in" cooler is about $700. A brief quotation will explain: The cooler is located in a community store. The store keeper is a member of the group and keeps all records of tests, weighs produce in and out of the cooler for all patrons, keeps the books of the organization and looks after the equipment. The cost of operation and maintenance of the cooler is prorated equally among the six members. The storekeeper who acts as manager of the plant is amply compensated for space furnished and for his extra labour by the benefits he derives from having the equipment located in his store. By using his allotted space in the cooler for storing meats to be sold over the counter and by selling surplus meat for other members, he has built up in a three months' period a thriving trade in fresh meat. The community did not have a dependable fresh meat supply prior to the installation of this equipment.

Space which is not needed by the members of the co-operative group is rented to non-members at a flat charge per hundred pounds of products stored per week. Revenue derived from non-member patrons is used to help pay operating expenses.

This ends the illustrations and I come to my conclusion. I could cite many more similar specific examples of the way in which the TVA is bringing real benefits into the very household of the humblest citizen. These examples have related to the rural citizen, but I could give others that show how the urban citizen also has profited in like degree. I leave it to your imagination to realize how the people of the entire Valley will be helped progressively when the beneficent wheel of improved prosperity begins to turn. The movement will be like an infection. It will be communicated first to the 17,000,000 people of the seven states and thence to the whole nation and to the other nations and, among them, primarily, Canada. In the meantime, Canadians can take time by the forelock by study of the TVA's purposes, its setup, its methods of operation, its failures and successes. Canadians, if they are really alert, can be prompted to institute enterprises in applied democracy in order to rectify certain comparable social and economic conditions in Canada.

I thank you, Mr. President. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Fox, we thank you most cordially for bringing to us this most interesting talk which all of us can plainly see is the result of boiling down a very large amount of information which you have gathered by reading and by personal observation. On behalf of the Club, I extend to you our warmest thanks.

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"THE EUROPEAN CHECKERBOARD"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. REX FROST

"THE EUROPEAN CHECKERBOARD"

Chairman: The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, March 30, 1939.

Before introducing the speaker, the President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C., called for a motion to nominate a Nominating Committee to select the officers for the coming year.

It was moved by Mr. H. F. Powell,
Seconded by Dr. F. A. Gaby,

THAT the following Members form the Nominating Committee for the Officers for the coming season of 1939-40:

Mr. J. H Brace
Mr. R. M. Harcourt
Mr. Dana H. Porter
Mr. Horace Harpham
Mr. George N. Hargraft
Mr. Leonard L. McMurray

Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C. (President)
Mr. H. C. Bourlier (Hon. Sec.-Treas.)
Members ex officio. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Before introducing our guest-speaker, I want to read a resolution which has been passed by our Executive for forwarding to His Excellency, the Governor-General. This is the resolution:

"The Empire Club of Canada, looking forward with eager loyalty to the expected visit of the King and Queen to Canada, respectfully requests His Excellency the Governor General to convey to Their Majesties an expression of the devotion of its members to the Crown and Person of the Sovereign, their humble duty and deep affection toward Her Majesty, and their happiness that in present troublous times the British Commonwealth of Nations is looking with unquestioning confidence to their King and Queen as representing all that is finest and most glorious in British history and tradition. The members of The Empire Club of Canada reaffirm their allegiance to Canada and a United Empire, their conviction that the close association, sincere co-operation and mutual loyalty of Canada and the Mother Country are necessary to the freedom and prosperity of both and their earnest desire that Canada with the other peoples of the British Commonwealth of Nations, shall work in harmony and mutual confidence to ensure, at whatever cost, the safety of free institutions."

CARRIED (with applause)

The President: Our speaker today is one of the best known and leading radio commentators, certainly in Canada, and I would like to suggest in the North American Continent, because so far as I can gather, no other commentator goes himself to the scene of the particular picture that he wants to look at and gets his information at first hand.

Mr. Rex Frost was born in London, England. He graduated from Cambridge University and then took up residence in Belgium and France, working in banking institutions where he had an excellent opportunity for gaining a wider understanding and interest in foreign politics. He has resided in Canada for a number of years but has kept in close touch with the international scene and in fact, I am informed he has made three trips to Europe within the last eighteen months. His last trip was on January 13th, when he left Canada for a comprehensive tour of Europe and during that trip he visited Berlin, Poland, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria and, of course, Great Britain. To most of us Mr. Frost is known as the President of the Arm Chair Club, and many of us listen each evening to his discussion of world affairs in his well-known chummy style.

I have much pleasure indeed in introducing Mr. Rex Frost. His subject is "The European Checkerboard." Mr. Frost. (Applause)

MR. REX FROST: Mr. President, Guests and Members of The Empire Club: When I was shown to my stateroom in the liner, Queen Mary, at Southampton, homeward bound for Canada on March 4th last, and found a cable lying on the dressing table which read, "Empire Club will greatly appreciate address by you Thursday noon, March 30th," I can assure you, Sir, I enjoyed a warm glow of pleasure at the compliment, for I really take it as a compliment that you have asked me to renew our association of thirteen months ago. The name "Empire Club" inspires in me a cordial responsiveness which relates back to the early days of my interest in world affairs, when as a young university student I belonged to an organization known as the "Junior Imperials," whose creed visualized and interpreted the destinies of the British peoples with the broad outlook of a United Empire. In recent years, as we must realize, there has been a trend to replace that central Empire unity of purpose of yesteryears by the more individualistic outlook of a commonwealth of nations. We have passed more recently through a period in which the several dominions which constitute the British Commonwealth of Nations have sought to evolve in many respects a detached viewpoint of their own, and few will deny that, broadly speaking, this modern aspect of progressive freedom in thought and action interprets our understanding of democracy in its most intelligent and liberal form. However, while I am still a relatively young man (you will notice I flatter myself) I am still sufficiently old-fashioned, that is in the eyes of many, to remain firmly convinced that our ultimate destinies as individual dominions, our mutual aspirations and fondest hopes for the future are wrapped up in the evolution of an unqualified unity of purpose which looks far beyond our own personal problems. Many of you, I am sure, will share with me some regret, perhaps an added modicum of apprehension, that there have been occasions of late when that unified outlook has been accepted with some reservation.

It will no doubt interest you to know that when I was in London four weeks ago I again heard discussed the interesting proposal to supplement the present British Cabinet by a Minister from each of the self-governing Dominions. If adopted, this would mean that the governments of each of the Dominions would send one of their duly elected representatives as resident Minister to London, in the capacity of a fully qualified member of the British Cabinet, to represent the Dominion interests and to assist in co-ordinating and unifying the vision of the Commonwealth as a whole in its relation to the foreign and colonial policies of the Mother of Parliaments. The proposals strike me as having a great deal of merit.

I hope, Sir, that these preliminary comments will convince you that it is a very real pleasure for me to meet again this afternoon the membership of a Club whose name suggests the breadth of vision, the dovetailing of ideals, and what is even more, in the face of today's challenge from without, the responsibilities of the Empire connection. But might I add, while it is a privilege to address The Empire Club, there are also drawbacks. You have made a practice of publishing once a year a very intriguing book in which you place on permanent record the addresses of your guests. From the speaker's point of view that is sometimes embarrassing. I recollect receiving some time ago from one of my radio critics a letter which read as follows: "Dear Sir: Regarding your radio address of last night, one year from now you'll wish you had never made it." With some trepidation, therefore, last week end I opened the covers of the book of Empire Club speeches 1937-38, to review the comments which I brought to you in February of last year. I might add that I have since replied to my correspondent saying: "Dear Sir: Regarding your recent letter, I wish I had never read it."

To deal first with Czecho-Slovakia. This afternoon I do not propose to discuss the conditions in that country prior to the time of the Munich Agreement. The pros and cons of the situation have been pretty well mulled over from time to time. Suffice it to acknowledge that, whatever the cause, conditions arose which gave birth in the Czecho-Slovak Republic not only to a Sudeten German separatist movement, but to a similar separatist activity among the Slovaks and Ruthenians. At the time the Munich Agreement was signed, all of the individual minority groups within the State were openly at loggerheads with the central government at Prague, and in many respects with each other. Germany, as we know, cashed in on the situation, annexed the Sudeten country, Poland got a slice, Hungary got a slice of the old Republic, and the remainder of the dismembered State was split up into an autonomous Slovakia, an autonomous Carpatho - Ukraine, with a Federal government at Prague to cover the interests of the Czech lands of Bohemia and Moravia and to administer in the joint interests of the Federated State as a whole—much about, I would say, a similar setup to the system of government we have in our own Dominion of Canada, the provinces with legislatures of their own, with local administrative capacity, plus a central Federal Parliament.

Today we face certain facts which, in their post-Munich form, must be accepted as they stand, facts which provide some vision for the future in eastern and south-eastern Europe. May I, therefore, largely concern myself first by bringing you a few illustrations of developments in Czecho-Slovakia since Adolf Hitler annexed the Sudeten country into the German Reich.

In the sphere of business I would like to tell you about a series of incidents as they were related to me by a promiment Czech industrialist around a dinner table in one of the fine old homes of Prague seven weeks ago. My host was the General Manager of a paper manufacturing concern whose head executive offices were situated in the Sudetenland zone. He described it to me as one of the most modern, as well as one of the largest paper factories in the old Republic. Immediately upon occupation by the Germans of the Sudeten town in which his plant was located he, as General Manager, was notified at his office in Prague that from that time on all production and management of the plant was under control of the German Commissar of the district, that all correspondence between the Sudeten plant and the Prague head office must be conducted with the approval of the German Commissar, and that communication by mail, telephone or telegraph was subject to complete supervision. Customers of the firm who owed money for merchandise shipped during the six months prior to the annexation were mailed a letter advising that all remittances must be directed to the Sudeten plant. Conversely, the Prague office was advised that it would still be permitted the privilege of settling any debts payable. For the time being, in other words, all incoming moneys to be handled by the German authorities and all outgoing bills to be paid by the Prague owners in Czecho-Slovakia. Should we call it a nice friendly little arrangement?

My host was next informed that coal required for operation of the plant must be purchased from Germany, and not from the Teschen District, as formerly, the Teschen District having been ceded in the meanwhile to Poland. The Prague head office objected on the grounds that their plant had been adapted and long operated on a special type of coal from the Teschen locality and counselled that a change might cause trouble. The objection was overruled, a type of German coal not adapted to the furnaces was put into use, with the result that within a few days the furnace grates burned out. The plant had to be closed for two weeks while the necessary repairs and replacements were made and a large number of employees were thrown out of work. But the crowning blow was when the German Commissar in the Sudeten town sent the repair bills to Prague for payment! Much as they raised objection, in view of the circumstances, they eventually had to pay them.

That is but one illustration of the difficulties under which the Czech businessman was operating in the post-Munich period. I could quote numerous incidents related to me to show convincingly that even in the case of self-contained industrial establishments in the post-Munich Czecho-Slovakia, there had developed a state of affairs whereby Germany had acquired a position of economic partnership in the running of the dismembered state.

Similar control was in evidence in the financial sphere. When Germany assumed control of Sudetenland, the Reich secured the equivalent of 150 million dollars in Czech currency and coin which was in circulation in the locality at the time, and this was approximately one third the total money circulating in the whole of Czecho-Slovakia. As an inducement to the Sudetens to quickly change their Czech crowns for German Reich marks, the Sudeten banks were instructed to convert Czech money into German at a rate of about 20 per cent higher than the normal exchange. This resulted in a rapid conversion of Czech crowns into German marks and the Reich authorities, having accumulated a huge amount in Czech paper money, promptly presented it to the Czech National Bank in Prague for redemption in gold. As it was impossible to redeem the paper money in gold without seriously influencing the status of the currency in the new Czecho-Slovakia, Berlin said, "All right, we'll take it out some other way; in the meanwhile you can regard it as an account payable. We will probably take it out in trade." Germany thus virtually placed itself in the position of the big creditor standing, as it were, on the doorstep holding a large volume of due bills for collection, a state of affairs which enabled Berlin to practically dictate most questions of policy to the Czech financial institutions. In the six months period between September last year and March of this year, Germany has virtually gained control of all arteries of Czech trade and commerce, both domestic and foreign, and the significance of that foreign trade of Czecho-Slovakia is the more realized by the knowledge that in recent years the export trade of Czecho-Slovakia has been more than twice as large as that of any state in central or south-eastern Europe.

What is more, the defenceless position of post-Munich Czecho-Slovakia had forced the dismembered Republic into the German political orbit, a government had been precipitated into office in Prague which had little or no alternative but to quickly respond to every demand made upon it by Berlin for political, economic and financial readjustment. You will understand what I mean, therefore, when I declare that the post-Munich Czecho-Slovakia was just as much lock, stock and barrel, a German protectorate in the several months preceding the official German declaration to that effect two weeks ago as it was after the storm troopers, the Gestapo and other symbols of Reich domination took physical possession.

While I was in Czecho-Slovakia just a few weeks ago I had an opportunity of discussing the outlook, as it was apparent at that time, with the Federal Prime Minister in Prague, Monsieur Beran, as well as the Leader of the Official Opposition in the House. I met also members of both of the Slovak parties, the militant Separatists and those of more moderate outlook. From these conversations I became convinced that all groups within the state had accepted the post-Munich status with a spirit of remarkable fortitude. I asked Prime Minister Beran in his office in the Kolovrat Palace in Prague for an expression of his outlook for the future, and he made it clear that his government had accepted the situation philosophically, had every wish to work out its new destiny, forgetting the prejudices of the past, and with a hopeful optimism based on a practical common sense understanding of the requirements of the present and future.

However, there was one point on which the Czechs were very bitter and definitely apprehensive. "Territorial guarantees," they said, "were promised us in return for the sacrifices we made at Munich. We have done Germany's bidding in regard to Sudetenland, we have given autonomy to our two largest minorities, we have returned the Polish and Hungarian areas to their respective countries, we have admitted German economic and financial control in the country, we have done everything of Germany's bidding . . . . but still the promised guarantees of our new borders by Britain, France, Italy and Germany are not forthcoming." While there was no definite suspicion of the impending German coup in Czecho-Slovakia while I was in any of the European capitals, the Czechs, I believe, smelled a rat when, having done everything to qualify for the Four Power guarantee, nothing was done about it and all they got when they pressed for specified performance was a stall, based on the reason that the delimitation of the new frontiers was incomplete in a few minor details.

We all know what happened. Germany walked in.

Before coming to considerations suggested by the train of circumstances which occurred in the Danubian area two weeks ago, I will bring you a few thoughts suggested by the train of circumstances which occurred in the Danubian area two weeks ago, coupled with a few impressions suggested by the circumstances within Germany itself. In official circles in Berlin no attempt is made to deny that the present German economy is conducted under very extenuating circumstances. In the German capital on the night of January 30th last, I heard the Reich Fuehrer make the following statement at the opening of the Reichstag: "Germany has always undoubtedly been in a very difficult position economically . . ." Rather than denying the fact, the Nazis conversely have sought to justify the necessity for a degree of economic privation, on the grounds that by the terms of the Versailles Peace Treaty, Germany was stripped of all its financial and economic resources. The German people have had that view thrust at them so frequently in the past five years that they are mostly willing to accept with a measure of good grace the present inconveniences of daily life in Germany, in the understanding that it is part and parcel of the programme to restore racial, political and every other sort of national prestige. At the same time, I did find during my recent visit a greater willingness on the part of the average German citizen to poke fun at the present difficulties of the household and business life, more so than when I was in the Reich eighteen months ago.

For instance, one German housewife told me, with quite a smirk, of an occasion when she recently purchased what purported to be two pairs of cotton rompers for her youngsters. When the garments were ready for washing, she put them in a boiler to boil out the dirt. Ten minutes later when she went to take them out for rinsing she discovered that the so-called cotton fabric had dissolved away into a sort of glutenous composition, or, as she put it, the rompers returned from whence they came — wood pulp or some sort of synthetic composition.

Then again, the story was going the rounds of Berlin when I was there about a certain lady who sent her husband out to do a little shopping. At the store he asked first for some eggs. "No eggs today," said the storekeeper. "How about oranges?" No oranges. "Any onions?" No onions. "Any butter?" No butter; tomorrow, maybe. So the customer picked up an advertising pamphlet off the counter entitled, "Winter Sports in Happy Germany," and took it home to his wife. "There, my dear," he said, "is the lunch." It was food for thought anyway!

It is true, of course, that there are queues in the German cities, particularly in Berlin, which line up outside the stores to get coffee. I saw them myself. And due to the shortage of paper, the German housewife is expected to take paper bags to the store wherein to bring away her purchases, and she must use these paper bags time and time again. Her purchases of certain dairy products, butter and other fats are restricted to the very minimum of requirements and she is continually faced in many ways by synthetic and other substitutes for many of the normal requirements of the household routine. Certain fresh fruits and fresh vegetables are not always obtainable. The homemaker is obviously put to considerable inconvenience at times to secure the foodstuffs of her personal choice; she may often have to accept something else. She cannot plan in advance, for instance, to have lamb for dinner; there may be no lamb the day she wants it and she may have to take veal, or whatever happens to be in stock.

Circumstances of this type you can read about without going to Germany. When you are staying in the Reich especially in a private household, little endeavour is made to deny an accepted condition. Facts such as these have given rise, however, to an impression in America and other countries that Germany is slowly starving to death. Such in my estimation very definitely is an exaggeration. There is enough food to go round of one sort or another, even although you may not be able to get what you want when you want it. It is quality and variety of food which is lacking in the Reich, rather than quantity. A German citizen who has the price need not go hungry. The inconveniences of the food situation are many, but they point to stress rather than distress, It might in fact be said that the whole German economy of the moment is based on shortage—by that I mean, an economic status in which demand consistently exceeds supply.

To prevent the normal rise in prices which would naturally result from such a condition, the Nazi philosophy has instituted a sweeping scale of price fixation. Most of the prices of essential foodstuffs are arbitrarily fixed by official authority, first to the producer, then through the respective channels of distribution, and finally to the retail trade. The normal laws of supply and demand do not function in Nazi Germany today, except in regard to certain commodities influenced by the import and export trade which might come under the influence of conditions that are governed internationally.

There is in fact, also a shortage of labour in the Reich, to a great extent brought about by the terrific upward surge of industries connected with rearmament and the speeding up of production of goods for home consumption, due to the curtailing of imports under the Four Year Plan. In working out his internal economy, Hitler has naturally been favoured in one respect. He came into power at the very low point of the world depression, and much as the Nazi programme has been planned with a view to dissociating itself from commercial and financial influences of the outside world, these influences have been inescapable. The trend of world business between 1932 and 1937 was vigorously upward and the steadily rising figures of German industrial and agricultural production during that period undoubtedly reflected in part the world trend. I have met economists in Europe who claim that world business conditions had a far greater influence in the upward surge of German production since 1933 than the Nazi leaders would give credit for. In other words, they believe that the expansion in the German economic scene resulted largely in spite of the philosophy of the National Socialist administrators, rather than because of it.

These same economists do not hesitate to express their belief that the German absorption of Austria and Sudetenland, followed by the progressive economic penetration into Czecho-Slovakia and the Danubian zone, has been forced on the Reich not so much by political considerations, but by economic and financial stringencies. Whatever may be the pros and cons of that outlook, and admittedly they are debatable, the fact remains that in Germany they are able to produce a maze of figures designed to convince you that the country's economic background is becoming stronger and stronger every day, and that Nazi finances are fundamentally sound. Moreover, in none of the European capitals can you find close observers of the economic scene of Germany who foresee an economic collapse in the near future. You hear it talked about a lot in North America, I know, but I find the consensus of opinion in Europe concedes the belief that the Nazi economy by various ways and means can sustain itself indefinitely, even admitting that its system refutes all the orthodox laws of economics and finance. The impression I brought from Europe is that anyone who believes Germany's economic collapse imminent is due for disillusionment. With the assistance of some of the recently acquired assets of her neighbours, she can keep going for a long time, perhaps even sufficiently long to get on her feet.

Among the questions uppermost in the minds of every student of international affairs are, first, what will Hitler's next move be? Second, what can be done to stop him? I think I can best deal with the first of those questions by telling you of certain uncanny apprehensions which were conveyed to me in Warsaw. In the Polish capital people were speaking quite glibly of the fear that their country was one of the next on the list. They spoke of the impending German reoccupation of Memel, and were quite concerned about the German penetrative economic thrusts which have been obvious for some period in the Danubian zone.

In considering the situation in Poland it must be borne in mind that Poland and Germany on January 26th, 1934, signed a non-aggresison pact duplicating in many respects a similar pact which Warsaw had concluded with Moscow two years earlier. One recollects also references made by the German Fuehrer not so many months ago, that he had come to quite a complete understanding with Poland, that he respected Polish rights to a Baltic outlet via the present Corridor, and in general indicated that relations between Berlin and Warsaw were quite cordial. They will tell you in Poland today that, in spite of her political and trade treaty with France, signed in the early post-war years, the desperate business conditions in Poland during the recent depression practically, if perhaps unwillingly, have already forced Poland into the economic arms of Germany. While, therefore, Polish friendship with France has been nominally the foundation of foreign policy in the Polish capital, the economic exigencies of bad times, the fact that Germany wanted Polish raw materials and was able to pay for them, resulted in a business relationship which the German Fuehrer now obviously is seeking to turn to political advantage.

While I was in Warsaw there quite naturally cropped up the question of Danzig. In the Polish capital they did not think when I was there that Hitler would make any deliberate aggressive move in regard to Danzig or the Polish corridor whereby to disturb the situation in that country, until such time as he was ready to go ahead and plunge into the accomplishment of his objective for the creation of an autonomous Ukraine, to be carved mostly out of Poland, Russia and Roumania. There are over six million Ukrainians in Southern Poland alone, and they were described to me by a press correspondent who knows that locality very well, as the worst treated minority in Europe. For that reason, Nazi propaganda in the Polish - Ukrainian areas has made considerable headway of late, the German Fuehrer being pictured, as also he was in certain of the Danubian areas, as "the liberator of oppressed minorities." This same form of subtle penetration is being carried into the Soviet Ukraine and there is a strong probability that, if this programme of infiltration of Nazi doctrine can be brought to the point of fruition during the next six months, there will come a day in Poland, they predict possibly August or thereabouts of the present year, when Hitler will declare he is going through Poland to preserve order and rescue the forty-five millions of the Ukrainians from Bolshevist terrorism. At that time Hitler will say to Poland, "Well, boys, are you with us or against us, because, whichever way it is, I'm going through to the Ukraine anyway."

I can assure you, Gentlemen, in Warsaw they take a very sombre view of that outlook. They place very scant reliance upon the non-aggression pact with Berlin. With this potential vision in mind, the anxiety of Britain and France to induce Poland and Russia to construct a

Four Power Stop Hitler Agreement is the more understandable. But on the other hand, it explains why Poland does not evince any eagerness to be drawn into any movement which may prove offensive to the German Government and draw down immediate retribution on its head until she, Poland, receives a commitment to definite simultaneous military action by the western democracies and Russia, should Germany march.

Enquiries which I made in the British Foreign Office a month ago indicated very conclusively that the British Government at that time was quite unwilling to give concrete military guarantees to Poland for automatic British military action. While there are rumours of a change of heart on the part of the British Government, no definite reversal of that policy has so far been announced. I doubt, personally, from what I learned, that it ever will be. However, in the absence of a definite iron clad joint commitment of military action involving Britain, France, Russia and Poland, there is little possibility that Hitler can be stopped in the east. So Poland now becomes the focal point of eastern Europe and its importance outweighs, in my estimation, any considerations elsewhere on the continent.

You may enquire, well, what about the Franco-Italian situation—isn't that serious? By comparison with the outlook elsewhere, I would say, no. In fact, as a general rule in Europe, everyone seems to feel that the difficulties between France and Italy could have been easily straightened out long ago. According to information given me in London, the British and French governments are pretty well agreed that they should concede Mussolini representation on the Suez Canal board. There is a further willingness to accord him certain privileges in the Red Sea port of Djibouti and some sphere of influence in the Addis Abbaba to Djibouti railway.

May I perhaps put it more explicitly this way: in principle, my conversations in and around the British Foreign Office left me with the impression that neither Britain nor France wish to deny the Italian government a share of influence in those points through which Italian traffic must pass in the line of communication between Italy and Ethiopia. The strategy of the moment is obviously to get Mussolini to specifically outline his demands before they sit around the conference table. While I was in London I learned that British and Italian diplomatic officials were engaged in informal conversations in which the British diplomats were endeavouring to convince the Italian not to exaggerate his demands upon France to the point that they would be completely unacceptable to the Republic.

Now, in yesterday's address by Premier Daladier, you will have noticed that he first laid down the principle that France would not cede one inch of her territory to Mussolini. He proceeded from that point to what is a seeming paradox, but which was obviously a conciliatory gesture, in remarking that France was willing to commence negotiations with the Italian Government on the basis of the Laval-Mussolini Agreement of January, 1935. The pact, as we know, found the French Government conceding territorial readjustments in the Tunisian zone and Djibouti, and provided also for a progressive revision of the status of Italian Nationals in Tunisia.

In Britain I find that they are getting sort of an ironical laugh out of the manner in which that Franco-Italian agreement of 1935 is being nominally made the subject of verbal brickbats between the French President and the Italian Duce. When Foreign Minister Laval went to Italy to negotiate and sign the now prominently-debated document, he was publicly dined and feted with sweeping enthusiasm. On the day of its signature, Mussolini informed the journalists and dignitaries present, "This Franco-Italian agreement will be a kind of continuous creation, in the course of which the friendship of the two countries will be endlessly revived." Monsieur Laval, proposing a toast to Mussolini said, "You have written the finest page in the history of modern Europe." Times certainly change! It is now pointed out that the agreement was never ratified by the Italian Chamber of Deputies, or whoever ratifies agreements in Italy, but the document did bear Mussolini's signature. The assumption is that, when the cordial festivities of the occasion were over and Il Duce had an opportunity to sit down quietly and digest its import, he decided that he should have asked for more. Last December he notified France that the pact was void. While on the surface there is a deadlock, there is little doubt, I find, in diplomatic circles in London, that the pact will eventually form the basis of negotiation and result in an agreement. At the moment both the French Premier and the Italian Duce are dickering for position, but I repeat, in London nobody seriously thinks that the situation offers any direct threat to the peace of the continent.

Among the interesting interviews which I enjoyed in the Empire capital was one with Sir Thomas Inskip Secretary of State for the Dominions. Until recently Sir Thomas occupied the portfolio of Minister for the Coordination of Defence, and in the course of our conversation I raised the point of Britain's so described "unpreparedness" and commented on the numerous inferences made since the time of the Munich agreement that Great Britain was hopelessly unready to defend herself from attacks by air. "I can assure you," remarked Sir Thomas to me, "that Britain now has an air force which could be depended upon to make a much better showing in the defence of this country than the public in general has been led to believe." He then went on to explain that during the past year the organization of aeroplane production in Great Britain had been developed to a very efficient point. "While we have not yet reached in this country the capacity for mass production of bombing aeroplanes which has been achieved in Germany, we are turning out better machines, and of importance, we are turning out now a larger number of ultra high speed fighting planes than Germany. We have access to higher quality raw materials than Germany and we are therefore building not only faster but more durable, more rugged, more efficient machines than our contemporary across the North Sea."

That was the import of Sir Thomas Inskip's comments. I might remark, Gentlemen, that Germany has been losing on an average one hundred pilots a month lately from crashes—seven times greater than Britain's losses.

Continuing, Sir Thomas said, "Even if we have not as large a number of planes as Germany in total, we are now in rapid production of fighters of the Hurricane type, which from all accounts could be depended upon to outspeed any ships which the Reich has now or is building on any mass production scale. In defence against air raid, speed," he added, "is all important."

I must say, Gentlemen, that the evening following my discussion with Sir Thomas Inskip, I went out to one of the airports just outside the London district and watched some of the new British Hurricane fighters in flight. About twenty-five of these tremendously fast machines took off for trial flights just as dusk was approaching, and on the evening in question I can assure you that it was quite an inspiring sight to watch. Their riding lights, which, turned on after dark, gave the impression of the flashing speed of a meteor. It was a colourful and visible illustration of the import of Sir Thomas's remarks—to the tune of 400 miles an hour.

Now, briefly in closing, Gentlemen, to deal with that most-frequently-asked and all-important question—is Europe facing war in the immediate present? Those of you who have been accustomed to follow my Arm Chair Club discussions will know that I have long had complete confidence in the belief that Europe would straighten out its problems without recourse to a major war. I maintained that viewpoint unflinchingly throughout the dangerous days of the crisis of last September. You know that I have always leaned to the side of optimism, I am not a warmonger and I have never subscribed to the belief that war is inevitable. While willingness and capacity to negotiate around the conference table exist, peace is reasonably assured. For twenty years that capacity has existed between the major powers of Europe, particularly between Britain and Germany. Two weeks or so ago, however, occurred an incident which injected disquieting complications—Germany marched into Czecho-Slovakia.

Now, six months ago when Mr. Chamberlain and Herr Hitler met in Germany the Fuehrer gave the British Prime Minister two major assurances: First, that once the Sudeten problem was settled, Germany had no more territorial claims to make in Europe. Second, he added that Germany had no desire to include in the Reich people of other races than Germans. These were personal assurances as man to man in private conversation, they were reiterated during Hitler's speech at the Sportspalast in Berlin, and still again repeated before the members of his own Reichstag. The principle laid down in those speeches was abrogated when German troops took possession of the Czech lands of Bohemia. So with every justification Mr. Chamberlain has now declared that henceforth he can place no confidence in the assurances of the German Chancellor. Thereby, today we find in Europe a new situation, a rupture in confidence, a feeling on the part of Mr. Chamberlain that further negotiation is of no avail. That one important pillar of confidence in negotiation which played such a significant part in upholding the structure of peace last September has now been removed. Reluctantly, therefore, must we conclude that the masonry of peace is weaker in its foundations today than it was at the time of the Munich Agreement.

I leave you with this thought, Gentlemen. There is one pillar of confidence which in these difficult days must not become undermined, it is your responsibility and mine to uphold—the pillar of confidence in a United Empire. (Hearty applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Frost, on behalf of the members of The Empire Club of Canada, I extend a very cordial "Thank you." What you have told us perhaps has not sunk in as deeply as it will after a short period of consideration. You have made statements today which to most of us are perhaps somewhat startling, but we join with you, Sir, in the thought that a United Empire is the answer, so far as Great Britain is concerned. (Applause)

"LONDON TO PARIS TO ROME"

AN ADDRESS BY GREGORY CLARK

Chairman—The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Tuesday, April 4th, 1939.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada: How can I introduce one whom you already know so well? Even if you have not had the privilege of speaking to him—I spoke to our guest yesterday for the first time, yet I felt I had known him for years—who is there among us on Saturday night does not turn over the pages to see what Greg and Jimmie are doing tonight?

Mr. Gregory Clark, our guest speaker, was born and educated in this city. He joined the Star in 1912 and rapidly rose through the ranks until today he is recognized as one of the best feature writers in North America. His coverage of such well-known scenes as the Coronation, the Vimy Pilgrimage, the Moose Mine Disaster and, later, the trip to Rome to describe the election of the Pope, speak for themselves and for himself.

Mr. Clark is well known to all of us also because of his stories as an angler of repute. But there is the other side. That was and is a peaceful diversion, but in 1916 he took the opposite side of the picture, joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and was awarded the Military Cross for gallantry in action. (Applause)

Still further, who among us listening to Mr. Clark's broadcast for the Star Christmas Fund has not been touched and touched deeply by his description of the poverty which he saw in the homes which he visited and, incidentally, whose pocket has not been touched by that description?

Gentlemen, I can only say that it gives me a very great deal of pleasure indeed to introduce to you Mr. Gregory Clark, who will speak to you upon the subject, "London to Paris to Rome." Mr. Clark. (Applause)

Mr. Gregory Clark: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It always strikes me as funny that a newspaper man can sit down and dash off words of wisdom, of infinite wisdom, to half a million readers at any hour of the day or night; but the minute he has to stand up and face even fifty or a hundred of his fellow mortals he gets a cramp in his intelligence and his courage vanishes. I wonder if the reason is the same reason I take it to be? I hope not. One advantage, of course, in being the newspaper man is that when you have a bad cold, as I have now, you merely tell your wife to bring your typewriter to you in bed, you put it on your "pinny" and the world can proceed on its majestic round; but I have to inflict my cold upon you and all these unseen guests.

I have just come home from a swift trip to Rome, Paris and London, and it is to report to you what I have seen and sensed that I stand before you now. Is there to be a war? How do people feel in Italy, in France? What were the impressions of a Protestant sitting within thirty yards of the papal altar at the Coronation of the Pope—one of the most sacred moments in the Catholic life? And what of Edward, Duke of Windsor? Perhaps you noticed that I saw him.

Well, as to no war, I will tell you presently that the men I saw all had two strong legs, two brave, searching eyes, stomachs that have to be filled three times every day. As to how the people of Italy or France feel, how can I tell you? I was as far from France and Italy as we are from the moon. What the man in the moon knows of our feelings I cannot venture a guess, though he has been looking down on us with that same expression of astonishment for how long? As to the Papal Coronation I will be able to give you some feelings and thoughts, but as for Edward, Duke of Windsor, all I will tell you is how I came to buy this suit of clothes I now stand in before you.

Fresh home from Europe the question everyone asks me is: How near is war? I am a little afraid, being a newspaper man, to avow my profound conviction that there will be no war for fear that tonight's editions might carry the dread announcement of war. Where are all the prophets? What a time is this for prophets! But, with my fingers crossed, I declare my deep, and intuitive feeling that there will be no war, not now and perhaps not for a sufficient number of years for those vast forces of humanity which are now struggling gigantically, as light struggles in the dawn, to triumph over darkness. That may seem a silly faith to you, who know of the powers and the men who are loose in the earth today. Great greedy and acquisitive power, inspiring whole races and nations, even as our race and nation were inspired in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and our sailors went with ships and cannon, round and round the earth, dyeing it red, with Shakespeare giving our intelligence self-confidence, and to Frenchmen and Spaniards and Germans and all we looked perhaps as dangerous and disturbing as certain other peoples appear to us today. It might be easy to take the ground, the philosophic ground, that life goes on and that as one breed tires nature builds another breed, but in Italy I saw a nation in the throes of a great modern revival. Its antique slums are vanishing, its crooked roads are giving way to highways more magnificent than anything I have seen in America, the buildings as majestic and beautiful as anything in all its glorious past, its tragic past. I say tragic, because on every hilltop is a ruin of either a fortress or a church in which men sought security and there was no security. In no country on earth is the pathos and the tragic comedy of the human passion for security more obviously written in stone and in dust than in Italy. In Italy, more than anywhere else on earth, it seems to me should be the dawn of the notion in men's minds that all the forms and ideas by which men sought security in the past are not good enough. There must be a new and a better idea. There must be somehow worked out a programme for the brotherhood of man. Yet, in Italy, where the slums are vanishing as before a juggernaut, where new cities are rising on the ashes of ten cities, you see no signs of that serene essence of humanity which is the joy of living in the faces and actions of men and women. Italy is a country without smiles, without song. Italians are often sombre and melancholy, as we all know, but in Rome, Naples, Florence and Venice, and in all the villages I motored through I was physically oppressed by the curiously sad abstraction, the solemnity of the people.

Don't leap to the conclusion that they are fretting under the Fascist regime. As far as I could discover or discern they are full of devotion to that regime. There are those who live in Rome, resident newspaper correspondents and foreign officials whom I met, and who think very differently, who believe the people are fuming under the oppression of Mussolini. I must declare that I could find no hint or word of that. They spoke with instant fire and enthusiasm of their Duce on every occasion. It is easy for us to say, "Ah, yes, they are afraid to do otherwise," but maybe we are wishful.

True, Italy is filled with police. Every cop has two assistant cops. The streets of Rome, especially, but also in most of the other cities, are full of soldiers, well-dressed, smart, self-conscious soldiers, with that look both Hitler and Mussolini deem to be part of the faith, a self-conscious, stony expression.

We must remember that until 1870 Italy was almost wholly agricultural, and that in the very blood and bone of the Italians are ages of oppression by princes, both native and foreign, and this latest revival, which is not the first in the century but the third great effort to revitalize the Italian people, is certainly the most intense.

But I am a profound believer in the biology of race. I know the difference between a Scotsman, and Englishman and an Irishman, and it seems to me perhaps biologically the Italians are not gifted for power and aggression. Maybe the reason they walk so sadly and abstractedly amidst all the splendours of their new renaissance is the same reason some of my friends who are writers, artists and musicians do not take kindly to getting up at six a.m. and rushing to the office at eight So much for supposition.

I talked to great numbers of young Italians. One train porter, alert, Italian to his core, said to me at the end of a conversation in which I succeeded in breaking him a little down, "We will never shoot Frenchmen."

Off in a vineyard, where I saw peasants working, sombre, unsmiling, labouring with mattocks in the soil, cultivating among the vines, I spoke to a vine culturist. I suppose if he were working in the Niagara Peninsula he would be making great money as an expert in his art. He gave me some idea of the wages they receive. A first class bricklayer gets $1.50 a day—$9.00 a week. Bread is 2½ lira—12 cents a loaf. The waiters who waited upon us in the hotels, where there is no tipping, get $50 a month. When I said to this vine culturist, "Are you satisfied? Is there any unrest under this regime of taxation and expenditure upon all this modernity, this new renaissance?" he looked at me with instant and surely unfeigned emotion and said, "Mussolini is a great man. If you see him he will look at you and read your thoughts." I said, "I hope I don't meet him."

In Naples there is a very marvellous restaurant, the restaurant of Li Theresa which many of you have seen, hanging over the water of the beautiful Bay of Naples. I was there and looked with great interest at the musicians. There was a guitarist, a mandolinist and a singer—three men. I had heard of the songs of Naples, its laughter, its music and song. This was the first I saw, after having been in Naples forty-eight hours. Here they were in the restaurant, off to one side of the Manageress's rostrum, where she sat with the money box, the three musicians, sombre, with downcast eyes. Suddenly, the Manageress snapped her fingers — let there be music! These three leaped forward, with mandolin and guitar, and teeth flashing, and the singer sang with joy all the familiar songs. They played and sang with gusto, smiles and flashing teeth. The minute they had finished down fell the veil of melancholy on their faces and they retired to stand with downcast heads until the snap of the fingers called for music, the smiles commenced and the music and song which is the tradition of Naples for its guests went on.

The man who drove me through the lovely country up to Assisi was a young man, about twenty-four years of age. I asked him about war. He was very proud of his soldier's uniform, all complete with beautiful cape. He said, "Signor, young men can no longer look forward to war as an adventure, as a patriotic sacrifice. Today war means in our minds only death. I think perhaps in your time and older times war had some balance, some compensation, but now it means to my mind, death. I do not want to die. How terrible it would be to be away fighting in some far place, knowing that every hour of the day and night my mother, my sweetheart, maybe, some day, my little children are dying terribly. No, no," he says, "war has nothing for me or young men, ever any more."

That was very sincere. That may be the thought that is in their minds as they stand with a curious abstraction and sadness.

I think of the darkness in the faces of Italy, but I also think of the strange, bright, hard light in the faces of the Frenchmen. What a joy it was to come down over the Alps out of Italy, into France, to see those fair-faced, wide-gaited, loud and laughing Frenchmen! In their faces there is a certain glint, too. A glint, which, if I were a statesman or a ruler or a master of wealth or power, I would not very much like to incite. No, the mass of mankind in this world, so far as I could see, here and there, do not want war. I think the mass of mankind the world over have risen all unawares to a position of power. I think the rulers of this earth must realize the gathering will to peace in the hearts of that mass of mankind. Almost any day now the power of cant and bunk and propaganda may collapse and vanish like a fog, like an old fog. I have the feeling we are on the verge of a sort of dawn somewhere, of something very great and splendid in human history, the appreciation of some clear and glorious truth we can't quite see yet, like the sun rising at the dawn. I cannot shake off that profound intuition of peace, despite every cloud that surrounds us.

Of course, I wasn't in Germany. After all this past century of false prophets, what good to go and stare at Germany? I would see only what has been seen before, there, here and everywhere — nations like ours and theirs, fighting for a place in the sun. Maybe it all has no end.

In Rome the Italian officials took me to the marvellous Exhibition where they are showing the Italian people the advances in self-sufficiency in Italy. They wanted most of all to show me the building where the arms and weapons of modern Italy were exhibited. They showed me monstrous bombs, shells, torpedoes, model planes of every description, engines of destruction. They told, with almost reverence, that Italy was strong, terrible in might; but when they took me to lunch I saw in the restaurants the Italian waiters serving, with a distaste so obvious that it was almost comic, the German tourists who now infest Italy these days in their great enthusiasm for the Rome-Berlin Axis. I saw in the same restaurant a long table, full of thirty Fascist Black Shirts, in their uniform of black shirt and gray trousers, entertaining about twelve members of the German Nazi Party in their bright brown uniforms and red swastikas. The dark Italians and the bright blonde Germans were all laughing heartily together but the Germans, fresh down from Germany, were casting curious, haughty and cold eyes around the restaurant at all us rag tag and bobtail. Before I left an official said to me, "Of course these Germans think they are God." Gentlemen, it isn't biological.

Of the Pope there is little that I can add to what I have written. The coverage of that assignment by a Protestant was, as you can well imagine, a most difficult task. It was like walking a tight rope across a great abyss, but my best Catholic friends assure me I share with Blondin the high wire title. This, I assure you, was due not to me, but to the Catholic priests who in Rome took me in hand, day and night, and stood by me, despite the great excitement and pleasure they had in that city for the twelve days I was there and with the greatest kindness gave every assistance to helping me get it straight. I must say also, I come of a family of Presbyterians and Methodists who have never been able to translate out of the Bible anything but love. I think that simple statement covers it.

Of the scene in St. Peter's, I would like to mention only two highlights. There was the procession into the church. St. Peters held sixty thousand people of the seventy thousand who could get in—sixty thousand because they had to leave space for the procession. We came into our places a little after five o'clock in the morning. My companion was Reverend Father Crossland, of Barrie, a young Canadian priest taking his Doctor's degree, and we got into our position a little after five in the morning and the procession didn't begin until eight-thirty. Into that immense church we came and waited, into that church where suddenly you are made of no account, because of its immense architecture. Wherever you stand it seems to be not far away, so beautiful are all the distances spaced. When you look the full length at some painting on a distant wall it seems to be just the right size. Not until you are under it do you realize it is 75 ft. tall, or that the little cupids I mentioned in one of my broadcasts, the little cupids over the holy water are seven feet high when you come close to them.

Into this enormous church came this procession, among sixty thousand onlookers, and for two hours we, who were in one arm of the cross and couldn't see down the long nave, listened to the stentorian cheers and roars of thousands, tens and twenties of thousands who could see His Holiness as he was borne in a high papal chair from one part of the ceremony to another in the great five or six hour ceremony. To sit there for two hours, listening to these roars of cheers in a church, and those roars and cheers seemed to be like cheers in a distant street, as though you were in a town, not a church, and it was men in another street who were cheering, was to me probably the strangest experience of my churchly life.

His Holiness drew near, down through the nave, passing from one chapel to another, receiving the homage of the Cardinals; the long procession, the Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops, in all their magnificent robes; then His Holiness came into sight, borne on his chair aloft, all in white, and you could hear the cheers then, not of just those who could see, but of all the thousands who could not see him—sixty thousand people madly cheering in a church. I ask those of us who are familiar, both Catholics and Protestants, with the silence, the reverent silence of churches, to realize how strangely different and how absolutely unique is this magnificent Church of St. Peters.

The other high spot was when the Pope, not yet the Pope, in white, with tiny cap on his head, white cap, white robes, knelt for forty minutes at the high papal altar over the tomb of St. Peter, with his hands in an attitude of prayer, while one after another of the external and accumulating glories of ancient tradition and liturgy developed to make him Pope.

Cardinal Caccia-Dominioni an aged man, passed around the papal altar and down the golden staircase, never otherwise used, to the tomb of St. Peter, where there is a little old stone tomb, dating back, this one in actuality 1700 years, and knelt there and his old voice, while we held even our hearts from beating too loudly, cried out of the great stairway, from the crypt of that ancient church, calling upon God and Jesus and Mary, and the archangels and the saints, one by one, and as each name was called to ring up through the spaces of the enormous church, the Sistine Chapel choir, a symphony orchestra of voices of men and boys would burst from a hidden pillar where they were all concealed, a glorious burst of music — "Tu illum adjuva" — "Aid Thou Him." And it was right there I realized what Catholics have in devotion to their faith.

As to the Duke, nobody is sorrier than I am that my story was so small, so slight. My son said when I got home it was as if Toscanini had conducted a great prelude and I rose from the back with a tin whistle and played a brief trill. But in that little whistle was all the heartiness I could put. It was a trick to get in to see him and the time may not be long before I can let loose the product of a most exciting, utterly delightful meeting with two people, so completely, wholly, and shockingly different from what we have perhaps been helplessly led to picture, that I count it among the greatest surprises of my life.

The office wired me in Rome to try and see the Duke of Windsor. I know why they did it. I am, unfortunately, a cocky little man with a nasty habit of charging new and larger hats on my expense account, so the office always tries to give me a sharp defeat before I ever come home from abroad. It is tough, you see, to be an Editor, chained to a desk from one year's end to another, and to have to welcome hirelings fresh off the Normandie. So they cabled me casually to drop in and see the Windsors. It seemed somewhat like receiving a cable to drop in and see Julius and Calpurnia Caesar.

I made the promise which I kept. I will not tell you how keen and renewed he is, how gone all the old nervous, harassed mannerisms, how incredibly beautiful she is, with a beauty that led her to so strange and fabled a life. I will not even tell about their lovely little house, nor of how he asked of so many things in Canada, and how we laughed about nabobs and snobs—all the things you could talk about to even plumbers and newspapermen and Dukes.

All I will do is tell you about this suit I am wearing. When I arrived all forlorn in Paris, I went to a certain contact which the Star has, a great news agency there, where I announced that I was going to try to see the Windsors. Now, these gentlemen to whom even a newspaper man from Chicago or St. Louis is from the sticks gave eye business to one another. Hadn't they been trying for two years? But I got from them the name of a lady—Mrs. Bedford—who is secretary to the Duchess, and I wrote a letter and mailed it and then went to the steamship office and the railway office and arranged my unhappy ticket and berth on the Normandie to come home. I packed my trunk for refusal, denial, defeat and home—and no new hat on the expense account.

At ten o'clock in the morning a lady called: "Mr. Clark?" "Yes." "Mr. Gregory Clark? Of the Star?" "Yes." "This is Mrs. Bedford. His Royal Highness wishes to see you at six o'clock tonight."

Now, I had a good brown Harris tweed suit. I had a nice light tan gabardine, or whatever you call it, and a dinner jacket and a coat with tails and a morning coat, but I didn't have anything for six o'clock. I was very jittery—more jittery than I was when first I stood before this little microphone. I stepped out of the hotel about noon, into the Boulevard des Capucines and looked helplessly about. As you know, I am not the shape of man for whom clothes can be picked down off a hook. I have never bought a ready-made suit in my life since I jelled. If it is wide enough it is too long, and if it is long enough it is much too long. I proceeded hopelessly amid all those beautiful people in Paris—in Paris in the spring—to find a place where I could buy a suit that would fit by six o'clock. I went down the street and I went into a store and consulted those in charge as to where I should go. They directed me to a store for gentlemen and I went down to the great store of Madelios. I was taken to the ready-made gents department and I explained it was a suit for this gentleman, off the hook, please, by four o'clock. I listened while they looked doubtfully at me, making their remarks in a type of French which I could not follow. They looked at me a little longer. Then I said that it was for an engagement with the Duke of Windsor. Such is the affection of Paris for the Duke that they leaped into action, took me into an inner sanctum, whipped off my bright tweeds, tried various suits until they arrived at this one. It was a little ill-fitting at the shoulders, a little long in the cuff, much too long in the legs. I said, "Four o'clock, Gentlemen." They said, "It will be ready, Sir." I said, "This must be Paris." They said, "It is, en effet, Paris."

With trepidation I went home. They close at noon. That is the kind of stores they have in Paris. They close at noon for everyone to go home and have lunch or go wherever they go. I went to my hotel to sit and quietly jitter. At four o'clock I called. There was the suit. They put it on me. It fitted, the shoulders fitted, the sleeves were right length, the pants were the right length. I said, "Gentlemen, this must be Paris." They said, "It is, en effet, Paris."

I very proudly rang three times on the bell for the valet. (Once for the waiter, twice for the maid, and thrice for the valet.) I rang thrice for the valet. He came and I asked him how I looked. He thought very nice, suggested a kerchief in this pocket, and he lengthened the trouser legs slightly by an adjustment of the suspenders. I said, "I think now I am ready," by which time of course the whole hotel knew the purpose of my purchase.

Time draws to a close. I have told you nothing. I have told in as good faith as I can of a swift trip around Rome, Paris and London. I haven't mentioned London. I don't think there is ever any need to mention London. London is the same as it was, the same as it will be—always London—the same as it was twenty-five years ago. These gallant people are busily going about their business, equal to anything. When I said to them, "How do you feel about these troubles?" they said, "'Let them come. Let them come." That is all I can tell you of London. I was only there forty-eight hours and I spent quite a considerable period of that time in the fishing tackle shops, and there, as in all the other shops, there is a cold, clear, bold courage in the hearts and faces and eyes of the Britisher.

Thank you. (Applause—prolonged)

THE PRESIDENT: It must be wonderful to be a feature writer and yet be able to speak as our guest has spoken to us today. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of all here and all who are listening on the air when I say that it has been a wonderful treat to have a description of events as seen by such keen eyes as those possessed by our speaker.

Mr. Clark, in thanking you on behalf of the members, I cannot resist the temptation, Sir, to say—with perhaps a little presumption, but a sincere desire that we will not be misunderstood, that we thank you, "Greg."

The meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"NATIONAL POLICY — 1939 VERSION"

AN ADDRESS BY NORMAN M. MACLEOD

Chairman: Mr. Wills Maclachlan

Thursday, April 13, 1939.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada, I am sure that we all deeply regret the inability of the President to take the meeting today. I will, however, endeavour to act as a substitute.

Again we have the pleasure of welcoming home Norman M. MacLeod. Much has transpired since he spoke to us less than a year ago. In these days of fast moving events which are recorded by radio at once or within minutes of their occurrence, it is extremely difficult for the average man to sift fact from fancy and to intelligently interpret the significance of events. We have all heard interpreters of whose background and motives we are ignorant and whose interpretations we question. It is therefore fortunate that in Mr. MacLeod we have one of our own, educated in local schools, colleges and universities, and for the past few years a member and past President of the Press Gallery at Ottawa, who has had a close view of the proceedings at the Capital and has ably interpreted those proceedings. Mr. MacLeod at the present time is the resident correspondent of the Windsor Star.

Mr. MacLeod's title intrigues: "National Policy — 1939 Version." I have great pleasure in presenting Mr. Norman M. MacLeod. (Applause)

MR. NORMAN M. MACLEOD: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I would be very unappreciative if my first words were not those of thanks for this "welcome home," as the Chairman so very nicely phrased it. When I spoke to this Club a little less than a year ago I expressed then my deep appreciation. Today I feel that whatever my indebtedness was to you at that time it now is multiplied many times. For a year ago you were simply taking a chance—as you inevitably must at times—on a rather unknown speaker. But today you are graciously paying me the tribute of a return engagement and it is quite impossible for me to express how highly I esteem that compliment.

I esteem that compliment because I recognize the Empire Club as one of the most worthwhile organizations this Dominion possesses. Its vision is large. Its interests are concrete and practical. It is concerned, in an intelligent way, with the fundamental public problems upon the solution of which our country's continuing national greatness depends. Its spirit is progressive and its outlook is sincere and serious, without being lacking in optimism. Consequently, it is impossible for one who is interested in national affairs, and whose daily pursuits keep him more or less intimately in touch with the developing national picture, to stand before such an organization without appreciating that, if he has anything to say of public import, here is the audience before whom he wants to say it.

Gentlemen, I feel that all of us here today are on common ground in desiring nothing but the progress of our beloved Canada and our beloved Empire, that all of us here today are prepared to bring free and open minds, unburdened of all partisan, racial, or religious prejudices, to examining some of the problems of our beloved Canada and our beloved Empire and that all of us here today are sincerely anxious to strive diligently in the light of our best judgment to promote the future greatness of our beloved Canada and our beloved Empire. It is for these reasons that I welcome so genuinely this opportunity of being with you.

My subject today is "National Policy—1939 Version." It is, I am afraid, not so much a subject as a goal at which I hope to arrive before I conclude my remarks. Since I spoke to you last I have covered Canada twice from Coast to Coast on assignments of political journalism. Consequently, I have been afforded a fresh and extensive opportunity of viewing some of our national problems in their actual geographic and economic setting.

What I am anxious to do mainly today is to argue a certain conclusion to which my practical observations have led me. In so doing I want to suggest—and illustrate my suggestion briefly—that in recent months we have tended increasingly to be less objective and concrete in our attitude toward our national problems, that we have been disposed to forsake, in our thinking with regard to them, the highway of facts for the forest of theory—and of abstract, constitutional theory at that. Finally, having argued for a concrete, and objective approach to our problems, an approach of action as contrasted with the theorizing and procrastination in which we have been taking refuge, I desire to leave with you, for your open-minded consideration, a suggested programme of development which, for the purpose of giving this address a title, I have termed "A National Policy—1939 Version."

I take it for granted that a speaker before an audience such as this may spare himself the labour of demonstrating that our country does face grave and serious national problems. All of us here today have the intelligence, I believe, to recognize that they exist. And, while we may differ individually in our opinions as to what the chief problem among them is, I suggest that if we take a broad, general view of the situation we will conclude without much difficulty that it is the one of national unity. Almost every crisis confronting our people nowadays, whether financial, economic or imperial, can be stated in terms of this central problem. Is it the ability of a province to meet its interest payments that is the issue of the moment? Immediately the question arises of the relation of that province to the Dominion and the responsibility which the federal government should assume. Is it a problem of tariffs and industry? Immediately the issue emerges of the willingness of one part of the country to co-operate in a policy which may be substantially for the benefit of another part. Or is it the question of defense that holds the centre of the stage? In this case also the consideration which becomes paramount is the possibility of preserving the unity of the two great races that are joint partners in Confederation.

And so it goes. The problem of national unity underlies almost every major situation which these troublous times are raising for our country. We do not like to think of Confederation as hanging in the balance, but we must all privately admit in our innermost thoughts today that it is standing urgently in need of repair.

Let me put to you briefly some of the more salient, if unpalatable facts of our national position today. First of all, what is the situation at Ottawa? Simply this: a succession of deficits, loaded upon the national exchequer by over-government, by excess railway mileage, and by the depression, have rolled up into a national debt of staggering proportions. There is nothing to be gained by fooling ourselves any further. Our national credit no longer can be regarded as inexhaustible on its present basis. That we have been able to maintain it unimpaired up to the present and that we are relieved of concern for the immediate future, is due, in part at least, to the fact that the money market of recent years has made it possible for us to refinance our debt at lower rates of interest. But make no mistake about it, the time is rapidly approaching when we will have exhausted the respite that refinancing has given us. Eventually—in fact speedily—we are going to have to set our financial house in order, or it will become apparent that, fundamentally, Mr. Aberhart's curious doctrines of Social Credit are no more fantastic than the beliefs of so-called "orthodox" governments that financing by means of budgetary deficits can be continued indefinitely without disaster. Yet how are we to set our federal finances in order? The national budget this year will be in excess of $600,000,000 and of that total a large percentage consists of items that are uncontrollable. I will return to this situation later.

Let us look now at the provinces. In Ontario and Quebec we have the allied problems of unemployment and the burden of relief. On the western Prairies, we have a revolt against the tariffs. And, despite the assistance that has been forthcoming from eastern Canada to the drought-stricken areas in recent years, an open propaganda for secession has been launched among the farm organizations. It is true that, numerically, the advocates of secession are still but a noisy minority. But surely the fact that they are able to gain an audience at all is significant. It is by ignoring movements of this kind, instead of treating them as the handwriting on the wall and removing the grievances on which they feed, that future large-scale trouble is stored up.

Turn now from the unrest in the West to conditions in the Maritimes. Economic distress is acute there among fisher-folk and miners alike. And there, too, just within recent weeks, an open secession movement has been revived, and actually is receiving press support. In fact, so rapidly has the secession propaganda been spreading that the Halifax Herald, which fortunately is the leading Nova Scotia newspaper, has found it necessary as a national duty to take up the cause of Confederation and a united Canada in an editorial crusade.

So we have the situation. We have a federal government that is bending under the financial load that it must carry. We have the seeds of secession sowing themselves broadcast in the Maritime Provinces and in the Prairie West. And we have the central provinces depressed in their industrial and employment outlook.

But it would be unfair to suggest that this situation is escaping the attention of the federal authorities. As a matter of fact, if we except the international situation with its overwhelming burden of anxiety, there is perhaps no other problem that is causing more concern to the Prime Minister than this one of national unity. I do not propose to discuss the partisan aspects of it. I leave it to my good friends, the Hon. Dr. Manion and Col. George Drew to paint their inimitable pictures of the happy Canadian family that was to follow the 1935 election and the reality that has ensued. I believe few developments have been more disappointing to our Liberal Prime Minister than this situation and, on an occasion of this kind, I would like simply to pay him tribute for having recognized the facts and having taken steps which he believes will lead in the direction of their solution.

Something more than a year ago Mr. King appointed a Royal Commission to deal with this whole problem of national unity. That Commission consists of some of the most eminent minds in the judicial, economic and journalistic life of the Dominion. Although it has not rendered its report as yet, I am confident that, as a result of its investigations, a mass of economic data of the most pertinent and valuable nature to the Dominion's future will be made available. But I am equally confident that, from the very nature of the national unity problem itself, any recommendations that the Commission may make will have to be supplemented by practical, dynamic policies that lie altogether beyond the constitutional field.

For, consider the limitations within which the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial relations must confine its suggestions. It can—perhaps will—suggest a reallocation of the powers of taxation. And if a surplus were available to be redistributed in either the Provincial or Dominion fields, there might be some hope of solving either the federal or the provincial budgetary difficulties by this expedient. But all that exists to be shared in either field is a deficit. A greater measure of consistency and logic in our taxation setup may be brought about by a reallocation of federal and provincial revenues but, beyond that, it is difficult to see how an over-all surplus can be achieved by any juggling of deficits.

The other possibility is that the Commission may recommend a transfer of sundry jurisdictions from the provinces to the Dominion. Now, obviously, the optimism that such a policy can excite depends on one's belief that there is some magic superiority in federal auspices which causes problems to dissolve once they come under them. The trouble, in this connection, is the absence of any concrete evidence supporting such a hope. The record of the Dominion in solving its own problems has not been so conspicuously successful as to encourage the belief that problems now provincial will be eliminated by the simple expedient of laying them on Ottawa's doorstep. On the contrary, it might be contended more reasonably that Ottawa's doorstep at the present time is so crowded with federal problems that there is no room for any additional provincial ones.

And so I say that, regardless altogether of this valuable work that the Dominion-Provincial Relations Commission may be expected to do, it is not only sheer optimism but the height of unfairness to expect that body to solve a problem of national unity which, fundamentally, is not a matter of either financial or legal relationships between the Dominion and the Provinces, and is not soluble, consequently, merely by a financial or a legal formula.

At this point I think you will be asking yourselves: What is the basic character of this problem of national unity? Within recent months I have tried to answer this question for myself in the light of my observations of conditions in this Dominion from coast to coast. And the conclusion to which I have come, suggested and confirmed alike by what I have seen in the Maritimes, in the central provinces and in the West is that, at heart, the problem of national unity in this Dominion is an economic one. The different parts of Canada are being emboldened to have greater faith in themselves than they have in the Confederation whole, and provincial leaders are being encouraged to set themselves up against national leaders, I am convinced, because faith has been lost in the ability of a strong central authority to point the way to salvation. No longer does a sufficient Dominion-wide sense of team play survive, or of united pursuit of a national programme. The national psychology that is abroad, instead of being optimistic for progress, is pessimistic in its belief that at best we are merely drifting toward fresh and unknown situations of trial. If a nation could mark time, Canada would be marking time today in its national life. But as a nation cannot mark time, but must either go forward in strength or disintegrate, I think we must face the fact that, below the surface as yet but nevertheless active, the forces of disintegration are at work in our Dominion today.

Gentlemen, I have said that I am convinced that, at heart, the problem of national unity in this country is economic. Let me particularize further what I mean by that. I mean simply that the economic motive that once was so powerful in binding Confederation together has been steadily fading from the national picture. In other words, in some parts of the Dominion, Confederation is no longer recognized universally as the sound business proposition that it once was admitted to be.

The view may be a shallow one. I believe it is. I am sure any of us would be willing to argue with a Saskatchewan farmer or a Nova Scotia fisherman who imagines that he would be better off outside Confederation than he is in it. But the fact that we believe that we could win such an argument is not the point. The point is that the Saskatchewan farmer and the Nova Scotia fisherman have lost temporarily their faith in the economic benefits of Confederation. I suggest that our task, if we are to achieve any real solution for the problem of crumbling national unity, is to restore the economic motive in Confederation for every one of the nine provinces that subscribes to the pact.

We need not cease being idealists if we simply admit that we live in a materialistic age and that, in times of economic stress such as we are passing through, the economic motive is one of the most influential factors in our lives. And so I say that if we can make Confederation good business for the Nova Scotia fisherman, good business for the Prairie wheat grower, good business for the British Columbian fruit grower, good business for the Ontario manufacturer and good business for the picturesque, witty and industrious French-speaking Canadians, then we need worry no longer about national unity. The problem will not only be solved; it will have solved itself on a basis that will prevent it from troubling us again.

The question is how to restore the economic motive to Confederation. Can it be done? Gentlemen, I believe it can, but only if we first reject certain counsels that are clamouring loudly to be heard at the present time. There is a school of thought that is on the march in Canada today. Its hosts are the battalions of fear and defeatism. They would have us pare everything to the bone, lop off the branches of our national expenditure without regard for the health and future stature of the national tree itself. And they would have us balance the country's budget immediately, without regard to the disturbance in the national economy that the rigours of such a programme would involve.

No one who has any sense of national responsibilty or any appreciation of the growing seriousness of the national situation will disagree with the motive that actuates this school of thought. Its aim is to rescue the Dominion from an ultimate fate of insolvency that must bring hardship to the classes of the citizenship least able to endure it. That objective is one that we all would be prepared to support.

But my criticism of the movement that offers civil and public service reductions as a solution for our situation is that no such programme can possibly meet the emergency we face. Advocates of retrenchment who talk about saving tens and hundreds of millions of dollars by drastic elimination of civil service waste are simply talking the most glittering generalities that can never be fulfilled. I cite just one fact to establish this proposition: Of the $600,000,000-odd which the federal government will spend during the current year, approximately $400,000,000 will fall into the category of uncontrollable, contractual expenses which can only be diminished by repudiation. In other words, Gentlemen, we have gone too far along the road of huge federal and provincial deficits and staggering accumulation of public debt for retrenchment to save us.

And so I say that the counsels of drastic retrenchment now endeavouring to sweep everything before them in the realm of public opinion in this Dominion are basically counsels of despair. Rigorous economy, although it may be recognized as more important today in the national picture than it ever has been before, cannot, by itself, lift us out of the morass into which we have fallen.

At the same time, I pay sincere tribute to those patriotic individuals who today are striving to arouse us to a sense of the growing national emergency that is facing our country. Some 72 years ago the Fathers of Confederation created this Dominion. Theirs was an act of deliberate planning. They faced a situation and they boldly plotted a course to deal with it. I do not think this audience will dispute with me when I say that once again we are facing a situation that calls for deliberate planning, and for the bold plotting of a course to meet it. Such a crisis is no time for howling down crusaders with sufficient national consciousness and patriotism to offer a solution simply because we do not consider their programme adequate. It is a time, surely, for examining all programmes with an open mind, for adopting perhaps some features from each and combining them all into a final plan that we hope will serve our country in the difficulties which it faces.

Consequently, while I refer to the advocates of a reckless economy programme—and I am convinced that there can be such a thing—as counsellors of despair, I do not do so disrespectfully, nor without appreciating that they at least are making a real effort to come to grips with our common problem. Indeed, my suggestion is that we should emulate their patriotic interest, while simply trying a different channel of thought. As a matter of fact, I suspect that many of these sincere individuals who are preaching the doctrine of national regeneration by retrenchment harbour the presentiment themselves that they are simply making a poor best of a very bad job.

What is wrong with their attitude and with their thinking? I wonder if we will not get our clue to the answer to this question if we compare the thought and spirit abroad in Canada today with the thought and spirit that infused the Fathers of Confederation? I believe we are entitled still to look back to those giants of our past as our examples of the ultimate in statesmanlike thought. Until we bungled their handiwork by our political excesses and reckless extravagances since the war, it was a magnificent job that they did for us. We cannot blame them for our troubles of today: we can only attempt to remedy our own abuse of the legacy they left us.

So let us compare our outlook with the outlook of the Fathers who met at Quebec and at Charlottetown, who looked west to what was a wilderness of forests and grass, and rivers and lakes and mountains and dreamed a Nation. Let us ask ourselves, simply, what was Confederation? My answer is that Confederation was a vision, a vision of the manner in which immense practical difficulties could be managed so that they would be the travail and the labour out of which a great people and a great nation would emerge.

Gentlemen, if we are all going to be the Fathers of Reconfederation today, as it is being urged that we all should seek to be, then surely what we need first of all is vision. Our horizon must not be limited by our present difficulties. We must look beyond it to a future greater than our past has ever been.

I have said that our uncontrollable and our contractual obligations prevent retrenchment itself from affording a solution to our problem. I make the further statement that our problem is insoluble so long as we are to plan our future in the terms of a nation of 11,000,000 people. Fundamentally, is not one thing that is wrong with Canada today the fact that we have governmental machinery, railway, highway, and other transportation services, and general facilities, sufficient to serve a population many millions greater than we have received? If our policy is to be one of a stationary population, we are like the builder who, after erecting a huge skyscraper for an office building, only half fills it with tenants and then wonders why his investment does not pay.

And so I say that our problem can be solved only on the basis of a greater population. But a greater population necessarily means that we must be prepared to offer more employment. And more employment necessarily means the carrying out of a programme of national development that will not only employ the newcomers to our midst during the construction period, but also bring new industries upon the scene to afford employment when the period of construction is over.

That is the way in which Canada has been built up in the past. The golden era of the Dominion's prosperity was the period of railway building, when work on construction employed its thousands and when, as the railway pushed ahead, new capital flowed into the country to take up land and establish industries along its route. There was no talk in those days of national disunity. Confederation was a going and a growing concern, with people eager and anxious to come from other lands to climb on the "band-wagon." I wonder if this audience realizes that in the three years following 1910 and prior to the war, no less than 1,000,000 immigrants took up their home in Canada? Consider the purchasing power, the demand for goods and services, and the new capital that these people brought with them. And contrast this figure of 1,000,000 immigrants for the three pre-war years with the figure of less than 38,000 for the past three years.

I do not believe that anyone here will suggest that Canada is even approaching the limit of its possibilities of development. But I do think that if we are frank enough we will admit that, under the strain and stress of the confusing years through which we have been passing we have lost the chart of national development that we were following. It is up to us to find that chart once more, to read it, and to set the Ship of State again upon the course of National prosperity. In other words, instead of thinking in terms of retrenchment and defeatism, we must think in terms of expansion and future progress. Canada has gone too far along the road of national greatness to be able to return to the once safe anchorage of mediocrity. She must reach the harbour which years of optimism have planned, or founder. No middle course is possible. The national overhead is too great for any cut in staff, or pinching of expenditure to meet the situation.

Now, on the assumption that you may agree with me so far in theory, I know you are asking where we can find any project of national development that would engage the labour of our people on a large scale, furnish a period of construction activity comparable to the old railway-building days, and leave in its train industries that would provide permanent employment for an enlarged population of many millions? I believe that if we are prepared to leave politics aside and examine the matter from the standpoint of the national interest, we have such a project right at our very doorstep. I refer to the St. Lawrence development undertaking.

May I say at once that I am familiar with the objections that have been advanced to the St. Lawrence scheme in this country. It has been urged that it would parallel the railroads—already struggling to maintain themselves and already burdening the national finances heavily — with another means of transportation that would simply cut further into their revenues. That argument, I think, is sound. As a means of transportation I do not think the St. Lawrence seaway project is justified.

But there is the power phase of the undertaking which, after all, is its major aspect. And, after having been myself an opponent of the general St. Lawrence scheme almost from its inception, I have become persuaded by my observation of conditions in the various parts of this Dominion and by my appreciation of the situation that we face—both nationally and imperially as a people—that it is expedient and even essential for us to embark on this project now, because of the power feature.

I suggest this because I believe the time is now at hand when St. Lawrence power can fulfil not merely a national but also an imperial mission. I wonder if the thought has occurred to you gentlemen that the British Empire is actually looking today, as it never has in the past, for a great industrial area to occupy, an area that will be reasonably beyond the reach of air raids and possible over-night obliteration by the bombs of enemy planes? I wonder if you gentlemen who are manufacturers on a large scale can enter into the feelings of anxiety with which owners of vast industrial establishments in the Old Country looked out over their plants from their office windows during the days of last September's crisis and wondered just how much of them would survive the first enemy air raids? Is it any wonder that in Great Britain today there is a practical movement on foot for the decentralization of the manufacturing industry which for so many years has been hived so densely on the tight little island?

I ask this audience what other spot under the whole British flag is better fitted to be a future workshop of the British Empire than the St. Lawrence Basin? Everything that industry needs is there. Power can be developed for $9 per horsepower. Steam power, which is what industry in the Old Country has to use, costs in the neighbourhood of $25 per horsepower. Cheap water shipment to all the markets of the world lies at the very door of any industry located there. The sections of the Dominion tributary to the area are a veritable reservoir of raw materials. And those that have to come from more tropical climates can be brought at a minimum of cost by water carrier.

In its construction stage the St. Lawrence project would mean, according to the figures used at the time the last treaty was negotiated with the United States, the expenditure of $197,000,000 upon Canadian labour and materials, of which the Dominion Government would finance some $38,000,000. It is probable that a new treaty would alter somewhat the proportions in which the cost of the undertaking would be borne among the Dominion Government, Ontario and the United

States. But, presumably, the total expenditure for labour and materials would be largely the same under a new treaty. Just what this expenditure upon labour and materials would mean to Canada in the existing condition of business and employment within the Dominion is a point I need not labour before a business audience such as you gentlemen comprise.

The ultimate power which the St. Lawrence undertaking will develop is 5,000,000 horsepower. And competent economists and engineers who have surveyed the district and its resources, its accessibility to the markets of the world and the easy availability to it of raw materials, have declared unhesitatingly that nowhere else in all the globe is there an area better fitted to support a dense industrial population. Lancashire and Sheffield are great industrial names. But there is no reason in the world, experts declare, why their glamour should not be eclipsed in time by the development of the St. Lawrence Basin as a manufacturing centre of Empire—and as an arsenal of Empire relatively free from air raid hazards.

Let us visualize an industrial population in the two central provinces increased by the development of the St. Lawrence Basin to 25,000,000 people—or even, not to look so far ahead, to 15,000,000 people. What would this mean to the other parts of the Dominion? It would mean, to the Maritime Provinces, a market for all the fish and coal that its primary producers could ship. It would mean to the Prairies an important market for their agricultural products at their very doors. Do you think for a moment that western Canada would become fanatical, as it is always threatening to become, on the subject of tariffs if it had an industrial market of 25,000,000 or even of 15,000,000 people in eastern Canada for its produce? I suggest that the main grievance of the West against tariffs is their failure so far to build up an industrial east that could absorb a sufficient proportion of western production. Similarly with the Maritimes: their restiveness in Confederation will disappear in proportion as we solve their economic difficulties.

In other words, I repeat that if we restore what may be termed the profit motive to Confederation, if we make Confederation once more a good business partnership to which to belong, we will solve at one stroke and in all parts of our Dominion the problem of national unity that today is giving us so much concern. And I submit that St. Lawrence development is the one project which, at the present time, can meet the requirements of the situation we face. It alone, I suggest, can open up a new chapter of national and imperial greatness for this Dominion upon which our hopes, not only for ourselves but also for our children, all rest.

Gentlemen, I have come to the end of my thesis. I am afraid my presentation of it has been unpardonably dull, but my defense for having wearied you is my strong belief that prevailing cries of defeatism — of national defeatism and imperial defeatism—are coming to have altogether too depressing an effect upon our national psychology. I believe that it is important that we should answer them, that we should proclaim to our people at large what we who have seen all parts of this Dominion have had impressed upon us at every stage of our travels, namely, that Canada is truly an invincible country, that resources sufficient to repair even our mistakes of the past lie ready to our hands, that we need recapture only the practical vision, the sense of adventure, and the faith of our forbears to build a greatness far beyond anything that we have yet known. That has been my thesis today. I have tried to present it in terms of a concrete programme. And I thank you sincerely for the attention you have given me. (Hearty applause)

CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacLeod, I am sure that you realize that every man in this room has moved a vote of thanks. On behalf of The Empire Club of Canada, I wish to extend that vote of thanks for a very brilliant and thought-provoking address.

Gentlemen, the meeting is adjourned. (Applause)

"CANADA'S DEFENCE FORCES"

AN ADDRESS BY

BRIGADIER R. O. ALEXANDER, D.S.O.

Chairman—The President, Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Thursday, April 20, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada: Forty-eight hours ago I had a report from the Medical Officer who is in charge of our guest speaker today, that he was confined to his bed with an attack of laryngitis and the odds which he then offered me were not at all encouraging. Yesterday, the situation improved, and this morning I was delighted to hear the voice of our speaker himself, when I telephoned his office. Like the British Army, and like the officers and soldiers of that Army, he cannot be kept down for long.

The Empire Club is very happy today to have this opportunity of welcoming our guest speaker, Brigadier R. O. Alexander, D.S.O., who in December last was appointed District Officer Commanding of this District.

The Brigadier was born in Ceylon, and has made his career in the army, just as many generations of his family have before him. He came to Canada in 1906 and obtained a Commission with the Victoria Rifles of Montreal in 1908. In 1910 he transferred to the Permanent Force. At the outset of war his regiment—and he, of course—went to Bermuda, to relieve a British regiment which was recalled to the Old Land. He was recalled from Bermuda and appointed Adjutant of the 24th Regiment, which was recruited in Montreal, and he went overseas in 1915. The Brigadier served with distinction during the war, being awarded the D.S.O. He was mentioned in dispatches three times and rose to command his regiment.

Following the Treaty of Versailles and the return of the Canadian troops, he was appointed a Staff Officer at Montreal. Later he was at Military College as Professor of Tactics. Then he returned to the Permanent

Force—perhaps I should say the more active Permanent Force—as General Staff Officer at Winnipeg, and D.O.C. at Saint John, N.B., Montreal and now Toronto.

Clearly, the Brigadier is well qualified to talk to us today upon the topic which he has chosen, namely, "Canada's Defence Forces." I indeed have great pleasure in presenting to you Brigadier R. O. Alexander, D.S.O. (Applause)

Brigadier R. O. Alexander, D.S.O.: Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is a great honour for me to be asked to address you here today, but I do so with a good deal of trepidation, as I feel I must remind you, as a serving soldier, I am a servant of the State, and any opinions regarding policy or conditions or what we are prepared to do, anything of that sort is the responsibility of the Government, and not the responsibility of its servant. The servant merely does what he is told. If my limitations in what I can say are disappointing to you, I am very sorry, but I feel that you will realize that those limitations are necessary.

Today I will try to give you some sort of picture of what your defence forces consist of, what they are trying to do, and some of their problems. There are many of you here today who are at present serving in those forces. The things I am going to say today you are thoroughly familiar with, and I am sorry for repeating them to you. I hope you will bear with me. There are many of you here today who have served at some time or other in the forces of His Majesty, either in times of peace or war.

I should like to remind you of a story. There was a time in England when it was often said, "Oh, he's the idiot of the family. Let us put him in the Navy or the Army." On one occasion a certain British Admiral was visiting one of the ships of his Squadron. The officers in the ship were introduced to him and the last to be introduced was a woebegone looking little shrimp of a midshipman. To the Admiral's question asking him when he had joined this ship, the young snottie replied that he had just joined. The Admiral looked rather witheringly at him and said, "The idiot of the family, I suppose?" To which came the rejoinder, "Oh, I hope not, Sir. You know, Sir, things have changed a good deal since you joined the Service."

Well Gentlemen, things have changed a good deal since I joined the Service, and perhaps since some of you did.

Our Defence Forces today consist of Naval, Military and Air Forces. They function separately under their own laws, but are controlled and administered under one head, the Minister of National Defence, assisted by a Council, representative of all the services.

The Chief of the Naval Service is known as the Chief of the Naval Staff and under him he has Directors of various things, such as intelligence, plans, operations, training, reserves, engineering and stores.

The Royal Canadian Navy consists of destroyers and coast defence vessels. On either coast are dockyards. To assist in the training of our own officers and ratings in our own Canadian Navy courses are taken with the Royal Navy, to a very large extent. It means, of course, that our own naval ratings and our own officers get the benefit of wide experience and excellent training—I suppose the finest training in the world, from a naval officer's standpoint.

There is a small Naval Reserve which exists as a reserve for the Royal Canadian Navy, and scattered throughout the country we have what is known as the R.C.N. Volunteer Reserve, which is the equivalent of the Non-Permanent Militia. Companies exist at different places throughout the Dominion, and they train at their local Headquarters and do practical training at sea each year with ships of the Royal Canadian Navy.

The Senior Air Force officer at Ottawa is known as the Chief of the Air Staff. Under him he has his own staff and his own Directors.

The Dominion today is in the process of being divided up into Air Commands. There is the Western Command and the Eastern Command, which include the protection of the west and the east coasts.

And, with headquarters here in Toronto, we have the training command.

That is all that is actually in being at the moment in the Air Commands. The remainder of the Air Force, where the Commands do not exist, come under the Military District, but they deal direct with the Air Force H.Q. in Ottawa on technical matters and others which come directly under them.

In addition to unit Headquarters, the main training centres exist at Camp Borden and Trenton. Training includes armament, navigation, flying, technical, army co-operation, equipment, wireless, bombing, and so on. In addition, survey photography and mapping are also carried out with the assistance of the Air Force.

Examinations, courses, exchange with the Royal Air Force are all carried out similarly to the Military Forces. I will go into that in a minute.

There is an Air Force Staff College now in England to which our own Air Force Officers go provided they pass the necessary examinations; naturally within a certain allotment.

Throughout the Dominion we have what are known as Auxiliary Squadrons, which are the equivalent of the Non-Permanent Militia.

The Military Forces of the Dominion, as you all know, are Active Militia. The Permanent Force is the permanently embodied portion of the Militia, and the remainder, known as the Non-Permanent Active Militia, are only called out for annual training and in case of emergency.

The word "militia" comes from the Latin word which means "military service," and also the word "miles" which means "soldier." The term has come to be applied to a constitutional force raised for the defence of the country. In England it is the descendant of the old Saxon "fyrd," under which each area had to produce its quota of men, to be responsible for arming them and carrying out training annually.

Through various stages the Defence Forces went down through history, down to the Trained Bands, and finally to Charles II's reign, when the Militia was formed, as we know it, and was organized, That Militia remained, with various modifications, down to 1908, when it lapsed or began to lapse in Britain, due to the organization of the Territorial Force, now the Territorial Army.

In Canada the first order imposing military service was issued in 1627, in Port Royal, Acadia. In it all male inhabitants were ordered to assist the regular garrison in cases of emergency. It smacks very much of that ominous word, "Conscription."

In 1649, in order to put down an attack by the Iroquois, the first call was made on the inhabitants for Militia Service. The Militia was divided up into Squads. A distinctive uniform was adopted, consisting of a long blue coat, with caps and sashes—Quebec, red; Three Rivers, white; and Montreal, blue. You may see a descendant of that particular form of garment around the Province of Quebec today.

In 1674, Frontenac organized the French-Canadian Militia into parish companies, under the Seigneurs, and this organization was still in existence when the country became British. Our first British Government was a military one. The Judges were military officers. The Courts of Law were composed of regular and Militia Officers. When the Division of Upper and Lower Canada took place, Upper Canada stuck to the organization of the Militia, as it existed in England. Lower Canada stuck to the seignorial basis, and the Maritime Provinces organized auxiliary forces on a volunteer basis.

The Militia Act of 1863 created a Militia and Defence Department and was presided over by a Cabinet Minister.

So you see, for over 300 years, the Militia of this country has been intimately connected with the history and development of the country. Canada was actually born fighting, and a great portion of our race are the descendants of soldiers. Some regular regiments were actually disbanded here, and many individuals, both officers and men, remained here when their regiments left these shores.

In 1749, 4,000 British veterans settled in Chebucto Bay and established Halifax. Go down the St. Lawrence today and you will find a number of French-speaking Canadians, with Scottish names, the descendants of the 78th Foot, better known as Fraser's Highlanders.

Today the command is vested in the King through the Governor-General, as his representative, and the Staff of the Army is divided into four branches: The General Staff—responsible for training, education, operations, intelligence, signals, surveys, maps, censorship, and so on.

The Adjutant General's Branch — responsible for organization, mobilization, discipline and all matters concerning personnel.

The Quartermaster General — responsible for movement and maintenance, which includes lands, buildings and engineer services.

The Master General of Ordnance — responsible for research, design and provision of vehicles, weapons, equipment, ammunition and mechanization.

The heads of these different branches are either members or associate members of the Defence Council in Ottawa and the Senior Officer of the Forces is the Chief of General Staff.

There is also an Interdepartmental Committee which co-ordinates the work of all the different Government departments with regard to Defence matters.

There is a Geographical Section of the General Staff which is really the Survey organization, which is equipped to survey and reproduce topographical maps by topography. It commenced operations in 1904, when there were no modern topographical maps of Canada. Since that time it has mapped 50,000 square miles. The work of mapping in Canada is co-ordinated by an interdepartmental committee, because, as you know, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Mines, and so on, do a certain amount of mapping as well.

The Air Force is of considerable assistance in all that mapping.

There is a photographic section of the R.C.A.F. and they and our own section, the Geographical Section of the General Staff, maintain a close liaison and they carry out work together. In fact, they are housed together at Rockcliffe.

The Dominion is divided into eleven Military Districts. Each is under a D.O.C., who has to assist him a staff covering the different branches of the Staff. The same branches as exist in Ottawa, but on a smaller scale. There is the Assistant, the Deputy, and so on, and that accounts for the grand conglomeration of the alphabet that you see stuck up alongside of their names, which are always extraordinarily difficult, I think, for a civilian to make out.

The Permanent Force is approximately 4,000. Its task is to run schools of instruction and assist in the training of the N.P.A.M., although the N.P.A.M. stand very firmly on their own feet, when it comes to training, with very little help from us, to form the Staff at National Defence Headquarters, Districts, R.M.C., and they are responsible for all military lands, buildings and materials. The acquisition of all buildings is actually in the hands of the Public Works Department.

The Permanent Force conducts courses for the different branches of the Service, all the different qualifying courses. I will just give a brief summary to show we are really trying to do a great deal. The different qualifying courses for different ranks and such courses as: Armoured Fighting Vehicles (tanks) at Borden; Intercommunication Services, the main centre being at Barriefield; Anti-Gas Training; Small Arms. (It might interest you to know that the infantry soldier of today has to learn and be trained to handle seven different weapons.) Army Co-operation with the Air Force and so on. The courses last for anything from two to ten weeks. Then there is in addition the Militia Staff Course and the Advanced Militia Staff Course.

The Militia Staff Course is the most advanced of the courses held, and it entails a lot of hard work in the evenings during the winter. At the end of the winter candidates have examinations and then they have two weeks practical course in the summer. The object is to train officers as Staff Officers, second grade appointments and junior staff appointments, and it has formed the nucleus of a very fine body of officers which if ever an emergency occurs will be of enormous value to us.

The Royal Canadian Signals, in addition to their ordinary duties, have established and maintain Signal Stations throughout the North West Territories and the Yukon Territory, linking up the northern outposts of the Dominion in a very effective manner.

The examinations of all the Permanent Force Officers are actually of an Empire nature. The written examinations are set by the War Office, and are corrected by the War Office. It puts us all on the same standard.

In addition to our own schools, our own officers go to advanced schools in England and three vacancies are granted annually for those who are successful in passing the necessary entrance examinations to the Staff College, either at Camberley, in England, or Quetta in India. The advantages of being able to attend these schools and courses are enormous. There has been a certain amount of criticism at times in connection with these schools and the officers going there. The advantage lies with us. The overhead entailed in us trying to run schools of that nature would be large and prohibitive, and it is of enormous value to our officers to go there and mix with officers of wide experience.

When I was at the Staff College there were fellows there from every quarter of the globe. They have up-to-date facilities and up-to-date equipment. In addition there is an exchange system by which a certain number of officers exchange, a few to England, and occasionally one to India with British Army Officers, who come and serve with us. It is of immense value to our officers, and I think of immense value to the British officers, who serve here with us.

In 1914, when war broke out, we had very few qualified Canadian Staff Officers. If my recollection is right we had only four, that is those who had passed the Staff College, and only those of us who served with them in the Canadian Corps can possibly realize what we owe to the British Staff Officers who were lent to us and who were our guides, philosophers and friends during that time when we were going through our growing pains.

Today we have a fine nucleus of officers who have qualified at the Staff College, in our own Forces.

The type of officer today is a very different one from what it was, say, twenty-five years ago. He is now a keen, temperate, hard-working youngster. He puts in a full day's work, a great many evenings are spent—I was going to say are spoiled, which is perfectly true—in instructional work—and most of his holidays—and he really does put in a full day's work, and is what one might call somebody who really earns his pay.

Naturally, in a Force of this nature it is necessary to have a good type in the ranks. We insist on the equivalent of 10th Grade High School for enlistment. He must be medically fit, and come with a good character. Some of the technical corps insist on as high a standard as senior matriculation for enlistment. Actually, in the ranks educational classes are going on and all the men before promotion have to pass and obtain various certificates, the highest being equivalent to about senior matriculation. The standard is going up all the time in the ranks.

In the Non-Permanent Militia, according to the Departmental Report for last year, approximately 5,000 officers and 36,000 other ranks were trained.

Each year Parliament authorizes a certain number of days training to be carried out—usually ten or twelve—for which pay is granted. Apart from small allowances for postage and things of that sort this pay is all which the unit actually gets in the way of money. The number authorized to train depends upon the funds voted by Parliament, and which is made available. Many more are trained than the numbers for which pay has been authorized. The result is that in most units, certainly all centralized units, the money is pooled, by both officers and men, into regimental funds and nothing is drawn by the individual at all. It means a voluntary self-sacrifice on the part of the individual. This money is spent on regimental activities, on regimental requirements, on refreshments after parade, paying car fare for the men to and from parade, and in some cases for buying boots for the men. The individual draws nothing, except in camp, where, of course, it is a different proposition.

The officers receive neither uniforms nor a grant in lieu. In fact he provides all he requires out of his own pocket.

In the Non-Permanent Militia the man receives an issue of clothing, consisting of a great coat and jacket, breeches or trousers, puttees, cap and equipment and arms. He receives neither boots nor gloves. He only receives khaki service dress and any other type of uniform has to be bought and paid for by the unit. So when you see these units in all other forms of uniform and dress, it has been paid for by themselves and is not paid for with the taxpayers' money.

The whole question of arms and equipment today is a very difficult one, owing to its colossal cost. After all, we have only to look at the estimates in Great Britain today to realize what the cost of rearming actually is. It is not the maintenance that costs, it is the capital expenditure on rearmament.

After 1918 all British countries hoped for peace and now we are faced with a world situation which, to say the least, is an extremely difficult one. There is a great deal of leeway to catch up, if we are going to put our Forces in the position of efficiency, so far as equipment goes. It involves heavy capital expenditure. In Canada, actually there is less per capita spent on defence than in any other country in the British Empire.

It might interest you for a moment just to know how the expenditure is controlled. All government departments are controlled by the Comptroller of the Treasury. There is an official of this branch in each government department. Each autumn the District puts up to Ottawa its estimates as to what it considers it will cost to run the various services and so on, for the fiscal year beginning the first of April the following year. These are reviewed by the Staff at Ottawa and passed to the Deputy Minister and Minister. After revision they are passed to the Minister of Finance, where they are digested, with all the estimates that come from other departments, and from him they go to the Treasury Board, which is a Committee of the Cabinet. The Treasury Board revises and prunes the estimates — chiefly prunes—and they go to the Cabinet itself. The Cabinet in due course passes them on to the Governor-General for approval. Then they are brought down and submitted to the House of Commons. All expenditures are subject to the scrutiny of the Auditor General, who is an officer of Parliament, accountable to Parliament alone, and not to the Government in power. He can only be removed by the Governor-General on address of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Now, Gentlemen, it might seem unnecessary for me to say to an audience of this kind, it *is* unnecessary to say to an audience of this kind that our Defence Forces exist with any idea of glorifying war, but you would be surprised at the things that are said outside. I have received a printed pamphlet about myself, accusing me of being a warmongering militarist. Whatever that means! I suppose I am included in the ominous term flung about the other day of "murderers called gentlemen." I suppose a rose by any other name—

Well, there it is. It is an extraordinary thing. We who have seen war, who have seen the tragedy of war, are its bitterest opponents, and I say that most sincerely, but what is the use of putting our heads in the sand and not facing realities? Our Defence Forces are a form of national insurance against an emergency that, pray God, may never take place. It is like training a fire brigade for a fire that we hope will not take place. We try to teach respect for law, order, constituted authority. We attempt to improve the physical fitness of the men who join the Militia.

I have heard the criticism that men in the Militia are a lot of weedy-looking specimens. It is quite true, they are, but that is not the fault of the Militia. The tragedy rests in the fact that there should be young men of 18, 19, 20 and 21 who are weedy poor physical specimens in this country. The Militia can't do anything very much about it. It can improve them a little when it gets them there. After all, a few nights a week in camp is not going to produce a fine physical specimen. It can help out the physical specimen that has joined us.

So the criticism is there, and quite rightly so, but it is not the fault of the Militia that the criticism should be there. We are trying to inspire comradeship and I think in that we are very successful. There is definitely comradeship right throughout. Undoubtedly, that is a wonderfully unifying influence right across the Dominion.

I have served now pretty well from Halifax to Calgary, and I find the Militia has a wonderfully unifying influence. It makes men realize the bigger things of Canadian citizenship, the ideals of Canadian citizenship, rather than the small parish pump outlook which, unfortunately, one finds at times.

If ever these Forces of our take the field in an emergency, we are trying to teach them how to save their lives and not how to lose them. That is the object of training. We are not trying to make warmongering militarists out of them.

The whole policy today is to try to gain success by the aid of mechanical means, by the aid of weapons, rather than through flesh and blood. Now, we can only do that when we have the equipment and the tools with which to do it. As I said before, that costs money. You know perfectly well that today with the economic situation which exists it is a problem to find anything. But if these Defence Forces of ours are going to be given the tools with which to do those things, they need the money to do so.

For instance, take these mechanical means. We have replaced the cavalry to a large extent with armoured fighting vehicles, light tanks. All unit transports are mechanized vehicles—trucks and so on, thereby increasing the speed with which we can move units. In the old days the unfortunate soldier carried everything he could possibly manage on his back. Now everything possible is carried for him and he is in a better position to do the fighting when the time comes. Most of you who served in the last war remember the sort of tedious column, which almost looked like an elephantine train, gradually creeping up toward the trenches with everything in France on its back. Those days are now gone. Everything is carried as much as possible by mechanical means, thereby increasing both efficiency of the individual and speeding up the whole situation.

With regard to weapons, today we are trying to teach all the different weapons—Vickers machine gun, Bren gun, and so on. We are trying to improve the mechanized weapon and vehicle situation as much as we possibly can, but we require the provision of them, more artillery, more guns. When I say more artillery I mean more weapons, more vehicles, more small arms. All these things require money.

These Defence Forces of ours are your employees. They give up their evenings, they give up their holidays, they give up the small pay they get, and they are faced with many difficulties. The chief difficulty they are faced with is lack of money. You might say that of most of us. Certainly, it is the case with the Defence Forces.

They also are faced with a curious difficulty, really, when you think of it. That is the lack of public support. They are faced with public criticism and they are faced, perhaps, by merely public apathy. It is a curious thing that a man should give up his time to train himself in order to defend his country in the case of an emergency, and that he should be held up to ridicule by his fellow men whom he is training himself to try and protect. No wonder the Continent always looks upon the Britisher as mad. It is a peculiar situation. The man in the Militia who is training himself like that is not a different class to anybody else. He is merely a patriotic citizen, trying to do his bit in his own way, feeling it is necessary to be prepared for a day when it might be necessary to be more than prepared. That is all it actually is.

Now, I realize fully that each one of you here who are employers have your own problems. I realize fully you have your economic problems and you have your difficulties, but, Gentlemen, I would ask you, as employers, if I might plead with you for one or two moments. It is hardly fair, perhaps, for me to be your guest today and then make a plea to you. But I would say, encourage your employees to join the Militia, the Defence Forces of this country, in other words. Permit your employees to go to camp and attend courses, if possible, in addition to their annual holidays, if they get any annual holidays, and at no financial loss to themselves. It is done in England, it is done in the United States of America, and I am glad to say it is done by a great many companies in this country, but the majority here with us today, both officers and men, give up their holidays in order to go to camp and train. It is pretty hard on the man but it is much harder on his wife and children when it comes down to a married man.

At the same time, it is done, and I think it is a most magnificent tribute to the men we have got in this country and their women, also. If a man goes to camp, don't let him feel that his job is jeopardized by his going. You would be surprised, but I know of two cases where a man has been given permission to go by his employer and when he came back his job was filled. It simply meant, of course, that the employer had no use for him anyway, and took that as an opportunity to get rid of him. It was pure lack of guts on the part of the employer, of course. That is all that it was. He should have fired him first.

It is all very well for an employer to be sympathetic and for the men to know that. Unfortunately, there is sometimes somebody below us that perhaps counts more in the eyes of the men even than those at the top, and that is perhaps the foremen in the various firms. You know as well as I do that you may be very sympathetic toward all this sort of thing, but if your foreman or your subordinate is not, that man stands a fat chance of going anywhere or doing anything. If you could just get that type, the foreman and so on, to feel the same way, then I feel a great advance would be made toward co-operation between the men and yourself and the Defence Forces of the country.

There are many employers, many of you gentlemen who are doing all in your power to help. I know you dont want me to thank you, because you regard it as part and parcel of your job, but I do say that I thank you most sincerely, on the part of the Militia, and I do say this, if you don't want to be thanked, it is very much appreciated. We realize perhaps you feel the way you do, and we appreciate very much that you feel that way.

The cornerstones of the British Empire have been and are "Duty" and "Service."

As we get older and look back on our lives, we have many memories and I think perhaps the esteem of our friends and the memories of personal service give us most satisfaction. The various things we have done and heard, and so on, which have given us a great deal of pleasure and upon which we look back with pleasure, but the feeling that we have served in some way our country and our fellow men in some form or other, not necessarily in war, but if we have served in some form, I think it is going to be a more satisfying memory than anything else. Not only that; it is going to make us realize that we are perhaps just a little bit more worthy of this magnificent heritage which our forefathers have handed down to us. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Sir, it is many years, I think, since the members of this Club have listened to such an interesting address upon the defences of our country. I could not help but notice that throughout your address you stressed the word "Defence." Not once did you suggest that the army of Canada, small though it is, is to take any part in any act of aggression. I do hope, Sir, that many employers have been listening to your remarks, because I know I voice the sentiments of all in this room when I say that they join heartily in your appeal that the employers may permit the employees to take that active part in the training for the defence of our country which is their bounden duty.

On behalf of the Club, Sir, I extend to you our warmest thanks. (Applause)

"OUR DEMOCRATIC HERITAGE"

AN ADDRESS BY W. J. LINDAL, K.C.

Thursday, April 27, 1939.

PRESIDENT: Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada, today we have the great pleasure of having as our guest speaker a prominent Canadian from western Canada, and a member of The Empire Club of Winnipeg. So far as I am aware, this is the first time we have had an opportunity of welcoming a member of our sister organization. The speaker, Mr. Walter J. Lindal, K.C., was born in Iceland. He came to Canada with his parents at a very early age and with his parents went on a farm. From the farm, of course, he went to the University and became a barrister. His practice of law was interrupted by the Great War, where he served with great distinction but at considerable cost to himself, because as a result of gas he developed tuberculosis. But, like the good fighter he was in the war, he fought tuberculosis, and he is now completely free of that dread disease. (Applause)

When I learned that Mr. Lindal was going to be in the East I could not help telegraphing him that we must have him speak to us before he returned to the West. It is my happy duty now to present to you Mr. Walter J. Lindal, K.C., member of The Empire Club of Canada in Winnipeg, who will speak on the topic, "Canada's Democratic Heritage"—Mr. Lindal. (Applause)

MR. WALTER J. LINDAL, K.C.: Gentlemen, may I, on behalf of The Empire Club of the City of Winnipeg, extend greetings and may I also state how great an honour it is to me to be offered the opportunity of addressing The Empire Club of the City of Toronto.

In the very troublesome world of today, when for the sake of self-preservation if for no other reason, certain nations or groups of nations are finding it necessary to unite their forces in their common defence, it is not out of place to let our minds wander back into history in order to see if a common ground of ideas and ideals cannot be found which might be made a background upon which such a common policy of defence might be based. On account of differences in race and religion, geography and climate, national ecconomy and outlook, this common policy of mutual protection will probably never assume a definite, tangible form. But, as the bond of union is more or less invisible, it is the more essential that the qualities of mind, and the special characteristics which these groups of nations have inherited through the ages, and the outward manifestations of these special attributes should be constantly kept before us. These qualities of mind and the institutions which they have brought into being form the subject matter of this address which I have entitled, "Our Democratic Heritage."

I propose to deal with our democratic heritage under four headings:

(a) It's origin.

(b) Canada's responsibilities under the Statute of Westminster, 1931.

(c) Canada's position in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

(d) Canada's position as one of the world's democracies.

The Origin of Our Democratic Heritage

A casual study of European history will reveal that certain groups of peoples in Northern Europe had some very definite and special characteristics which appeared to be common to them all. For want of a better word, this group of Northern European peoples may be referred to as the Nordics. Professor Carleton S. Coon, in a book on anthropology, just off the press, called "The Races of Europe" says that the word "Nordic" is the most famous word in anthropology. Probably what he should have said is that the nations which have descended from the old Nordics are the most famous in all the world. The most typical Nordic, he says, is the Duke of Windsor.

Some Germans, notably Herr Hitler, have attempted to appropriate to themselves the word Nordic. This is quite erroneous. What Nordic blood there was originally in Northern Germany has disappeared. Professor Coon states that the Prussians are related to the Slavs, whom they so despise, and are partly of Mongolian origin. He also points out that Russians, on the other hand, in the area extending from Finland to the Ukraine, through migrations and infiltrations of blood are more Nordic than the Germans.

A famous English anthropologist, Prof. F. G. Parsons, says (Winnipeg Tribune, April 7, 1938): "As a matter of fact, I don't believe they have any Nordic blood left in Germany. It has been completely bred out by admixture with the Central European Alpine, a fundamentally different racial type. England has a great deal of Nordic blood and practically no Alpine, which disposes of the erroneous tradition there is cousinship between Germany and England."

Who were these people? Let me take you back to Northern Europe a little over a thousand years ago. The area I have in mind centres around the Jutland Peninsula. To the north were the Northmen, or Nordmen, who occupied the southern part of the Scandinavian peninsula. In, and immediately south of the Jutland peninsula, were the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes. Farther south were the Low Germans and to the southwest the Frisians, in the territory now known as the Netherlands.

What, if anything, did those people have in common peculiarly characteristic and distinct from other European races?

They were individualistic, they were impatient of restraint, they were restless and they were adventurous. The love of liberty and freedom; the right of every man to hew out his own destiny; independence in thought and action—these are the warp and woof of the Nordic races. But, coupled with that independence, is the desire to band together for the common good. That instinct was probably inculcated by slow degrees through centuries of struggle with the forces of nature. But that banding together was not at the expense of individual freedom. There was a determined opposition to any forced submission to dictatorship, whether an absolute monarchy or in any other form. In short, it may be said that in the qualities of mind and special characteristics of those peoples are seen the fundamental or root elements of present-day democracy.

Lord Baldwin, in the series of addresses delivered a few days ago, refers to the same qualities of mind in present day English character which he describes as "the curious combination of individualism and the power of co-operation." They are the same qualities that existed in these people over a thousand years ago.

As was to be expected, these people moved to other lands. They travelled east and west. They brought with them their racial characteristics. In the new soil they were transplanted, cultivated and often improved.

Early in the Fifth Century the Angles, Saxons and Jutes began their expeditions to Britain and, within a comparatively short time, drove back the Britons and settled the country. Local forms of government soon emerged: the hundred moot, the shire-moot and the Witenagemot. Here we find the foundations of present-day parliamentary and municipal forms of government.

This migration was later followed by another migration to England, but it took a different, a more circuitous route.

Late in the Ninth Century tribes of Northmen, whose Chief was one Hrolfur—or Rollo—moved to what is now a part of Northern France. The softened form of the word Northman is Norman and the district they settled was called Normandy. The recognized establishment of the Normans in France took place in 911 in a treaty between King Charles, the Simple, of France, and Rollo, who became the first Duke of Normandy. William the Conqueror, a direct descendant of Rollo, crossed the English Channel in 1066, fought King Harold at the Battle of Hastings and proceeded to conquer England.

In the Normans we see at its best the Nordic capacity for adaptation and rapid outward assimilation, while still retaining their own essential attributes. In Normandy they adopted the French tongue and the French manners. But, what is more important, they very quickly absorbed the passion for organization which the French had inherited from Rome. This they brought with them to England. And there the task fell to them of bringing about a much-needed stability and a greater centralization of power. They found close kindred in the English and the Danes and proceeded to improve upon the customs, usages and forms of Government of a people in which they themselves became completely merged.

Some of these people moved east and southeastward to territories that are now part of Russia, Poland and the Ukraine. The first King of the former Kingdom of Ukraine, Hrorek, headed one of these expeditions. In these areas these people became as completely merged as the Normans in France.

Two other Nordic or Northman migrations should be mentioned. In the latter part of the Ninth Century King Harold, the Hair-fair, had conquered most of Southern Norway. Many of the nobles and odalsmen refused to become his subjects, quitted their lands and sailed to Iceland. The innate desire of these people for an orderly form of government for the common good soon found expression. In the year 930 the leaders met and established Althing, a thing, or Parliament, of all the people. In 1930 the people of that island celebrated the thousandth anniversary of their Parliament.

Perhaps a brief digression at this point might be pardoned. Partly in order to correct an erroneous impression which may have been created through misinterpretation of discussion in the House of Commons, but more so in order to place evidence before you supporting the argument I am advancing, I desire to point out that in the last war, voluntary enlistments from Canadians of Icelandic descent were, by population, higher than the average of the Canadian-born, and higher than those of any national group, other than the English and

Scottish. (Applause) I cite this, Gentlemen, only to prove that the stronger the Nordic strain, the more deep-rooted the desire to preserve the principles of democracy, and the more immediate the willingness to make sacrifices for those principles. Hence the response from these people in the last war.

About the same time as Iceland was settled, a Northman colony was founded in the Isle of Man. There, also, a Parliament was soon established. The present composition of the House, now called the House of Keys, is twenty-four members, the same as that of the original. Until 1916 all laws passed by the House were proclaimed on Tynwald Hill. Tynwald is a changed form of the old Icelandic or Norse word "Thingvoll," meaning a plain where a Thing, or Parliament is held.

As has been pointed out, people of Northman descent settled in Northern France. France is now a democracy. But in that country there is a tendency toward either the extreme left or the extreme right. It seems to lack the balance so noticeable in Great Britain and in the other Northern European democracies. That is, I believe, because such a large percentage of the people of France are of Latin and Alpine origin. The Northman settled only in Normandy and Brittany.

It is interesting to note that most of the French people who settled in Quebec came from Normandy and Brittany. In many of their descendants can be seen the features and characteristics of the old Normans. That is the reason neither Communism nor Fascism find so ready a soil in Quebec as in France.

One more example. It is pretty generally conceded that Spain was destined to go to the one or the other extremes of dictatorship. The failure of democracy in Spain shows how difficult it is to transplant the principles of democratic rule among people in whom are not the qualities of mind essential for democracy to flourish. In anthropology the Spaniards are referred to as Mediterraneans, people of the same origin as the Moors, the Egyptians and the old Carthaginians. In the Spaniard there is lacking the necessary blending of individual and collective responsibility, on the one hand, and the corresponding liberty and privilege, on the other. Spain was a democracy for a few years. But those who happen upon freedom cannot long retain it. The will to freedom must be innate in the individuals themselves if democracy is to thrive.

The Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands and Belgium all have well-established forms of democratic rule and are not experiencing any difficulty in resisting extremes of movements in any direction.

Wherever the Nordics settled or wherever the Nordic strain is strong or predominates, democratic governments have been established and still survive. But though democracy still prevails in all these countries it should not be forgotten that it was in England where the main battle was fought for the most of present-day democratic principles and ideals. The British Parliament is not the oldest but, in every sense, it is the Mother of Parliaments. It was in England that a Magna Charta was signed in 1215. It was in England that a king was beheaded in order that the rights and liberties of the people might be preserved. It was in England that the Bill of Rights was passed. It was in England that fundamental principles of democracy were laid down, such as responsible government, freedom of thought and religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It was in England that the move was initiated for the emancipation of slaves and the ultimate abolition of slavery. Every lover of liberty and freedom, every person who can appreciate what democracy means — whether he live within or without the Empire — should bow in reverence as he meditates upon what the people of that little island have accomplished in laying the foundation for those ideas and ideals we value and cherish so much. (Applause)

British conceptions of government and human action have been transplanted in many lands, at times in a soil congenial, at times wholly barren of what was needed for democracy to thrive and flourish. For that reason democratic institutions have in some places been uprooted; in others they are threatened. The resistance was not sufficiently strong; the Nordic strain, "the curious combination of individualism and co-operation," as Lord Baldwin described it, was lacking, or at least was not strong enough.

Canada's Responsibilities Under the Statute of Westminster, 1931

Although it may be freely admitted that democracy, as it obtains today, and as transmitted to us, has its many weaknesses and imperfections, nevertheless, it may be safely said that certain fundamental and elementary principles have, through the centuries, become so thoroughly imbedded in every system of democratic or parliamentary form of government as to be a part and parcel of the system.

The following might be mentioned as a few examples:

(a) Freedom of the subject in his person and property.
(b) Abolition of slavery.
(c) Freedom of thought and religion.
(d) Freedom of expression of opinion in the press or otherwise.
(e) Freedom of assembly and of association.
(f) Freedom from imprisonment without trial.
(g) Freedom from confiscation of property without legal process.

I have sometimes wondered whether the Canadian people realized what was involved when they obtained autonomous powers over their own affairs in the passing of the Statute of Westminster in 1931, and the responsibility which was cast upon them in their new independence of preserving those fundamentals of democracy to which I have alluded.

Prior to 1931 certain safeguards did exist. In 1865 the British Parliament in its wisdom passed the Colonial Laws Validity Act. Section 2 of the Act reads as follows: "Any colonial law which is, or shall be, repugnant to the provisions of any Act of Parliament extending to the colony to which such law may relate, or repugnant to any order or regulation made under authority of such Act of Parliament shall to the extent of such repugnancy be and remain absolutely void and inoperative."

A wise precaution, though fortunately it has not often been necessary to invoke it.

It should be noted that colonial laws repugnant to laws of England extending to the colonies were null and void. Disallowance was not necessary. But now all that is changed and quite properly so, in view of our new status. Sections 1 and 2 of the Westminster Act read as follows:

(1) "The Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865 shall not apply to any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion.

(2) No law or provision of any law made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion shall be void or inoperative on the ground that it is repugnant to the law of England."

Where does the responsibility now lie for guarding the essentials of our democracy? I submit, largely on the Dominion Government and, to a lesser extent, on the Provincial Governments. The Dominion power of disallowing Provincial Acts may in the past not have been of much importance but, since the passing of the Statute of Westminster, it has become vitally important.

I sometimes think that our political leaders do not realize as yet to the full the responsibility which the Statute of Westminster has placed upon them.

Our Federal political leaders must be ever alert in the guarding of the fundamental rights and liberties of the Canadian people. And a similar duty rests upon our Provincial leaders, lesser perhaps, but that is only because of the protection afforded in the Dominion power of disallowance.

Canada's Position in the British Commonwealth of Nations

I intend to approach this from two points of view: First, Canada's duty to the Commonwealth at the present time. Second, the unifying influence upon Canada of the British connection.

I need not picture to you the world situation as it is today. It has from month to month been getting more ominous, more threatening. A few days ago, when the world was on the brink of a catastrophe, a temporary lull was brought about by the eleventh-hour noble effort at conciliation made by President Roosevelt. We can but hope and pray that it may meet with some measure of success.

It seems to me, therefore, that our present duties as Canadians may be approached from a purely Canadian point of view—possibly a narrow-minded, selfish point of view. Sentiment, British or Anglo-Saxon tradition, should perhaps not be allowed to influence us. I, for one, regard that sentiment as a virtue rather than a vice. There is one criticism sometimes made that I resent very much. I, as a Canadian of other than Anglo-Saxon descent, can refer to it. It happens altogether too often when a Canadian of Anglo-Saxon descent is extolling the British Empire, is advocating the retention of the British connection, he is at once charged with being a jingoist, being a blind sentimentalist, or being an Imperialist, using the word in its worst connotation. I say I resent that charge against men who appreciate the British Empire, appreciate what it has done for them and are only too anxious to retain it. (Applause) I said I regard that sentiment a virtue, not a vice. But, in our approach to this question let us discard sentiment. In any case it does not enter into the make-up of a portion of our population. But we, as Canadians, are concerned with the preservation of what we have; we are concerned with the preservation of Canada itself.

There are those to be found among us who adopt an extremely narrow-minded, an isolationist point of view. As these men do not belong to any particular political party or national group I feel that I am not entering into a political controversy in criticizing their point of view. They view with indifferent detachment all that Great

Britain has done in the past, all that Great Britain is doing today to maintain world peace. They accept the British fleet and not only that, but Great Britain's tremendous armament expenditures as their first line of defence. But they see a second line of defence, if the first fails. In the policy of the United States of enforcing the Monroe Doctrine and resisting foreign aggression on this continent they see their second line of defence. For that reason they do not seem much disturbed over the possibility of the dismemberment of the British Empire. In that case, they argue, Canada need but fall back on her second line of defence. There is nothing very heroic in that attitude of mind.

I find it difficult, Gentlemen, to appreciate this attitude of mind in any Canadian of any descent, but in a Canadian of Anglo-Saxon descent it is little short of contemptible ingratitude. (Applause)

A narrow Canadianism, closely akin to that of isolationism, and largely supported by isolationists, has emerged recently. Its appearance at the present time is, because of the international situation, not only regrettable but actually injurious. I refer to the move precipitated last winter in support of neutrality legislation. It centres around a Bill introduced in the House of Commons, asking that Canada declare her right to neutrality in case of war.

The status of Canada—if Great Britain becomes involved in a war—has already been well established in addresses on the floor of the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Minister of Justice. It can be briefly summarized as follows: If Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war; but the nature and extent of Canada's participation will be decided by Canada itself.

I am of the opinion that a discussion of this subject at the present time is not only untimely, but actually injurious to the cause of peace.

There is only one question we should ask ourselves. Can the march of the Dictators be halted? I think it can. It is being temporarily halted and I think even Canada can make its small contribution toward further staying their aggression.

It may be that eventually nothing will deter the Dictators. The deterrents, if any, are:

1. The heavy arming of Great Britain and France.
2. The changing attitude in the United States.
3. The solidarity of the British Empire.
4. Defence alliances of the democracies of the world.

One of the redeeming features of the Munich tragedy (and I am not condemning it) and the present international lawlessness and brigandage is the change in the United States. Newspapers have again and again referred to the revulsion in the United States to the Dictators, the withdrawal of American opinion from the isolationist point of view and the narrowing of the gap between them and the western democracies.

You are all familiar with the pronouncements which President Roosevelt has made from time to time culminating in that supreme offer of mediation made a few days ago. In these pronouncements, President Roosevelt, a true lover of democracy, is leading the American people toward the western democracies. He has at times, in his impatience, found himself far in advance of his people, and has had to pause, and even retrace his steps, in order that American opinion might catch up with him.

As I read the outbursts of indignation which appear from time to time in the German press against President Roosevelt, I can, in my mind's eye, see Herr Hitler, I would say, frothing at the mouth. But I can also see him winking one eye and chortling to himself when he reads about neutrality discussions in Canada. Press dispatches from Europe only a few days after the neutrality debate took place in Ottawa show how much those discussions have pleased Herr Hitler. In an interview which Hitler had with former Chancellor Von Schuschnigg, shortly before the Anschluss, he stated that the Dominions would not take part in an Empire war and that, in such a war, the break-up of the Empire was not only likely but extremely probable.

But at the very time when President Roosevelt is leading an American crusade toward the western democracies, we in Canada, with the isolationists in the van, are to select the same moment to give notice to the world of dissension among us and to declare our right to neutrality. To do so in this hour of peril, when all our forefathers fought for, all we hold nearest and dearest to us is threatened, is to my mind a narrow-minded, an unpardonable and blind selfishness which I fail to comprehend. (Applause)

At the present time we should bend backward to show a unity of the Canadian people and a solidarity of the Commonwealth. No one knows the fighting qualities of the Canadians better than a German soldier and Herr Hitler served in the ranks.

The Unifying Influence of the British Connection

I think we should be sufficiently charitable to those who are preaching isolationism, neutrality and other forms of narrow Canadianism, to credit them with sincerity. They are sincere in their desire to see a strong, virile and united nation develop in this country. We all want to see that.

The mover of the Neutrality Bill stated on the floor of the House of Commons: "Canada should . . . . not take part in war unless some principle greater than peace itself is involved—such as the civilization of the world, Canada's national existence, or the liberty of her people. If these are involved they are greater than peace, but no issues other than these are greater than peace."

This is, generally speaking, the point of view of those favouring neutrality legislation. It will be noted that an attack on Great Britain and the possible dismemberment of the British Empire are not mentioned as issues sufficiently serious to warrant Canada's participation. But does it ever occur to those who hold these views that two of the three issues which are mentioned, namely, Canada's national existence and the liberty of her people, are closely related to the British connection? They are, to my mind, to a very considerable extent dependent upon the British connection. These men, it seems to me, fail to grasp what it was that brought about Confederation and, in their pleas for Canadian unity, forget one of the main forces which will maintain that unity.

Within the borders of Canada there are five distinct groups: The Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairie Provinces and British Columbia. By reason of geography, climate, race and creed, these groups have little in common. Their interests are diverse rather than mutual.

There was something deeper in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation than a mere desire to join together separate colonies in North America. Today there is something deeper in the minds of those who want to see a united Canada than keeping together nine far-flung provinces. Part, though not all of that something deeper, is the British connection. What really binds us together, Gentlemen, is the voluntary association in a Commonwealth of Nations, or rather, a commonwealth of democracies, whose ideas and ideals are the same as ours. What will keep us united as a nation is a loyalty to principles and ideals, rather than to any particular race or even a particular territory. It is because these principles and ideals are largely inherited from Great Britain that the British connection is and always will be one of the strong unifying forces in the Dominion of Canada.

This is a fast-shrinking world. Australia is as close to Canada today as Saskatchewan was to Nova Scotia a few decades ago. Sentiment in Central Canada to British Columbia and Nova Scotia is perhaps not much more deep-rooted than sentiment to Scotland, England, or even New Zealand. Geography is no longer the determining element. What binds us together is a common crown, a common heritage, common ideas and ideals.

If the British connection is broken, I fear for the future of Canada as one nation. If the British Empire is dismembered, I fear for democracy anywhere in the world.

Canada as One of the World's Democracies

In October last Clarence K. Streit, a Rhodes scholar from Montana, published a book which he calls "Union Now." It is already in its sixth edition. His book, which is well-documented, is a plea for a federation of democracies. The conclusion he reaches is that world stability can be brought about only through a defensive alliance of the fifteen leading democracies in the world. There are: The United States, Great Britain, France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Norway, South Africa and New Zealand.

I delivered an address on this subject a year ago before The Empire Club of Winnipeg—long before I had heard of Mr. Streit. It may appear somewhat strange that he should include almost identically the same nations as I did. But yet it isn't strange. The nations he enumerates are those in which the Nordic strain dominates, or is very strong.

Mr. Streit points out that though there are differences in these nations, brought about by geography, race and creed, yet these people have for over a hundred years lived in peace with one another. These people, he shows, are alike in their outlook on life, in their love of personal liberty and freedom and in their ability to so blend collective responsibility and individual freedom as to be able to govern themselves and ward off every form of dictatorship.

President Roosevelt, in his appeal to the Dictators, enumerates the same European democracies and some others east of the central powers. I think it can be truthfully stated that in the case of most of the nations east of the central powers, democracy, where it does exist, has been transplanted, rather than grown from the virgin soil. His plea, therefore, is in its essence for the federation of these nations which have nourished and developed democracy from its rude beginnings. In any case, they will have to bear the brunt of the defence of democracy if it is challenged in a world war by the Dictators.

In referring to the President's offer of conciliation, our Prime Minister said, "No country can reject that opportunity for saving civilization and saving itself."

Today, we in Canada, Gentlemen, should forget internal differences. We should stand united, and in that very unity show the solidarity of the British Empire. And though only a small nation, we should make our contribution to that larger, world-wide, democratic front. We should be ever mindful of the fundamental Nordic traits and qualities of mind which are the foundations upon which western civilization rests. That foundation, that common heritage, may provide an invisible but yet a very powerful bond of union and co-operation among those nations in which those very qualities are still strong, namely, the British Empire, the United States, France, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries.

But we must not forget that it is Great Britain which has in the main provided the bulwark against dictator aggression in the past; we must not forget that it is Great Britain which has built up most of the hitherto, shall I say, impregnable defences for democracy. We are not worthy of our heritage if we seek to weaken rather than to strengthen that bulwark and those fortresses. (Applause)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lindal, on behalf of the members of The Empire Club of Canada in Toronto, we thank you most sincerely for your instructive, enlightening and inspiring address. We would ask you, Sir, to carry back to The Empire Club in Winnipeg the very best wishes of its sister Club in Toronto, and to express our hope that the Toronto Club may shortly after the beginning of its new Club year have an opportunity of listening to another such inspiring address from another member of The Empire Club of Winnipeg.

Now, Gentlemen, this is our last regular meeting of the year.

To Dr. Gaby I extend my sincere thanks for his all too flattering remarks in connection with the little I have been able to do during the year. We have all endeavoured to do our best and I must say it has been a great encouragement to the President and the Members of the Executive to note the splendid interest on the part of the membership in the activities of the Club. I would also say it has been a great encouragement to receive letters and telephone calls from the vast audience that listens to us by means of the radio. To them and to you, the members of The Empire Club of Canada, your retiring President expresses his most cordial thanks.

The meeting is adjourned.

ANNUAL MEETING

Thursday, April 27, 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: Gentlemen, this is our Annual Meeting, and upon this occasion the President is permitted to speak for a few minutes.

First, I would like to mention that the Year Book is well advanced and we hope to have it to you within perhaps six weeks.

I would also like to say that we are losing one of our Past Presidents. You have probably noticed in the press that Mr. James H. Brace, a former President of this Club, has been appointed Vice-President of the Bell Telephone Company, with headquarters at Montreal. Those of us who know Mr. Brace compliment the Bell Telephone officers upon their good judgment.

We have lost a total of twenty-six members this year, through death — one life member, Sir Henry Pellatt; twenty-four resident members and one non-resident member. Among the resident members I shall mention only a few: Sir John Aird, Rev. Canon W. L. Baynes-Reed, Sir Joseph Flavelle, and Mr. Kenneth J. Dunstan.

There is one point, Gentlemen, which I want to stress today. When this Club was organized the means of communication of the views of the speakers was confined to the voice, as from one person to the other. Naturally, we have a great desire that the views should be expressed and that the membership should be increased. That continues today, of course, but I want to point out what to me is one of the most striking features of our Club activity. That is the vast number of people who listen to these proceedings each week. I wish I had time to read to you some of the letters received. When Dr. Fox spoke here a few weeks ago his wife and daughter, together with many Toronto people in Georgia, heard him very distinctly. One of our speakers was heard by his sister in Fredericton, N.B., and not by means of a hookup. She did not know that he was speaking until she heard his voice. We have a regular listener in the Yukon. So you see the opportunity that is afforded in the broadcasting of these addresses.

Here is a letter received from a missionary in the north:

"I wish to extend to you and The Empire Club my deep and sincere gratitude for the opportunity and privilege of enjoying your guest speakers each Thursday, over CBL.

"Words cannot adequately express all that it means to one, such as myself, in this isolated country. From fall until early summer I hardly ever get away to meet and converse with men with wider spheres of opportunity. As I have said, words cannot express all that I would like to convey to your Club, so I must suffice myself with a sincere 'Thank you.' "

And this from another:

"I cannot listen to any more of your Club broadcasts without letting you know how much I appreciate them and how my wife and I look forward each week to hearing them.

"You would be surprised if you knew the number of people who listen in here each week. This is only a small village of about 800 people. I want to personally thank your Club for affording the people living outside of Toronto an opportunity of hearing these excellent addresses. It is really an education."

Here is a letter from Gowanda, New York State, in which the writer comments on the address delivered by Colonel George Drew.

We talk about our slogan, "Canada and a United Empire"—if we can reach people in the United States with the thoughts expressed by speakers who come to us from week to week, I firmly believe we can do a good service toward uniting the views of the English-speaking nations of the world, and I think that should now be our objective.

On that score, I appeal to you, on behalf of the new President and the new Executive to do what you can to increase our membership, not for the $4.00 alone—because we try to see that the $4.00 goes back to you—but so that the work of this Club may be broadened and we may fill a larger place than we have heretofore in the forming of public opinion along the lines of peace and justice.

The annual report of the Treasurer will be published in the Year Book after it has been audited. I am glad to tell you that the Club is in a very satisfactory financial position, and that our cash balance has increased to over $3,000.

The next order of business is the Report of the Nominating Committee. It has been handed to me and is as follows:

Moved by Mr. R. M. Harcourt,
Seconded by Mr. Leonard McMurray,

That the following Officers be elected for the year 1939-1940:

President: .... F. A. Gaby, D.Sc.
1st Vice-President: ... Rev. Canon H. F. D. Woodcock
2nd Vice-President: ... Major Lawrence Junkin
3rd Vice-President: ... Lyman Crawford-Brown
Honorary Secretary-Treasurer: H. C. Bourlier
Honorary Auditor: .... H. T. Jamieson
Assistant Treasurer: .. W. W. Comber
Executive Committee: . F. L. Clouse
Major G. R. M. Dingle
Goldwyn O. Fleming
Robert Fleming
Horace Harpham
H. F. Powell
Frank Pullen
H. L. Southall
J. D. Spence, K.C.
Dunlop Stewart
E. F. Thompson
F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, K.C.
Wills Maclachlan
C. R. Sanderson
W. E. Humphreys

REV. WILLIAM HILLS
A. ROSS ROBERTSON

Immediate Past President:
J. P. PRATT, K.C.

Representing Past Presidents:
NORMAN SOMMERVILLE, M.A., K.C.
F. J. COOMBS
R. A. STAPELLS

THE PRESIDENT: If there is no dissenting voice, I will declare the Report of the Nominating Committee carried. (Applause)

I take much pleasure in asking the President-elect, Dr. Gaby, to take his seat at the left. (Applause) I now present to you the President-elect, Dr. Gaby. (Applause)

DR. F. A. GABY: Mr. Pratt, I thank you for the remarks that you have made and I am quite sure that I join with you in your views as to the enlargement of the Club's interest in the affairs of the country so far as the Empire is concerned.

I deeply appreciate the honour that you have conferred upon me and I am further very grateful for the appointment of such excellent officers and Executive Committee to act with me in the furtherance of the work and aims of this Club. I am sure they join with me in accepting that responsibility, having the knowledge that our best energies and efforts will be to serve this Club in the furtherance of its work in its thought and interest in the national and Empire problems. These problems are much more important now in this most critical period of the history of the Empire and are further emphasized by the disturbed state of mind of our people in view of the tremendous evolution and progress that is taking place in our national economy and that of the world.

I shall not enlarge upon this very intricate and difficult subject. However, in some measure we are familiar with the evidence in our own country of the differences of opinion on the necessity of a unified Canada and apathy toward Empire associations. Our national progress and prosperity are dependent upon a clear understanding of the problems confronting us and it will be our goal to maintain the high standard of the work of our Club in providing such material as will be of guidance and assistance in directing your thoughts and actions in the furtherance of Empire matters, along with our national, economic and social problems.

I sincerely thank you for the high honour you have conferred upon me and with your co-operation and assistance there is no doubt that we may look forward with confidence to the successful maintenance of the traditions of the Empire Club.

I would not like to let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation of being associated with Mr. Pratt during the past year and to compliment him and extend my congratulations to him on the excellent manner in which he has administered the affairs of the Club. This year has been most successful, not only from the standpoint of the outstanding speakers that have addressed us, but from the financial standpoint. This success is a credit to Mr. Pratt and to the Executive Committee who so ably assisted him, and I am sure we all appreciate their efforts and extend our congratulations to them. I thank you. (Applause)

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONT.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th APRIL, 1939

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1938		$2,619.58
RECEIPTS		
Membership Fees	$4,039.00	
Bank Interest	54.69	
Sale of Year Books	10.00	
Sale of Luncheon Tickets by Secretary-Treasurer	500.00	$4,603.69
PAYMENTS		
General Expenses:		
Postage, Printing and Stationery	$2,141.16	
Telephone and Telegraph	237.44	
Fees and Expenses of Speakers	427.50	
Recording and Publicity	477.80	
Luncheon Expenses (after deducting proceeds from sale of tickets by outside agencies, $4,313.00)	766.15	
Miscellaneous Expenses	16.46	
	$4,066.51	537.18
Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1939		$3,156.76

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1939; that we have obtained all the information and explanations we have required and that, in our opinion, the above statement of Receipts and Payments is properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the transactions of the Club according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us and as shown by the books of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1939.

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,
Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario,
26th May, 1939.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason.*
1905-06	Rev William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.*
1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.*
1909-10	Elias Clouse, Esq., M.D.
1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.S.S.*
1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., DD., D.C.L.
1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig.*
1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart.
1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Musc. Doc.
1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.*
1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.*
1921	Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
1924	William Brooks, Esq.
1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C.
1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.*
1928	Robert H. Fennell, Esq.
1929	Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
1930	John D. Spence, Esq., K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq.
1932-33	Lt.-Col. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Dana H. Porter, Esq.
1935-36	J. H. Brace, Esq.
1936-37	Major G. B. Balfour.
1937-38	R. M. Harcourt, Esq.

* Deceased.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

YEAR 1939-1940

Officers:

President: F. A. GABY, ESQ., D.SC.

First Vice-President: REV. CANON H. F. D. WOODCOCK

Second Vice-President: MAJOR LAWRENCE JUNKIN

Third Vice-President: LYMAN CRAWFORD-BROWN, ESQ.

Honorary Secretary-Treasurer: H. C. BOURLIER, ESQ.

Assistant Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, ESQ.

Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, ESQ.

Executive Committee

F. L. CLOUSE, ESQ.
MAJOR G. R. M. DINGLE
G. O. FLEMING, ESQ.
R. FLEMING, ESQ.
HORACE HARPHAM, ESQ.
H. F. POWELL, ESQ.
F. PULLEN, ESQ.
H. L. SOUTHALL, ESQ.
J. D. SPENCE, ESQ., K.C.
DUNLOP STEWART, ESQ.
E. F. THOMPSON, ESQ.
F. B. FETHERSTONHAUGH, ESQ., K.C.
WILLS MACLACHLAN, ESQ.
C. R. SANDERSON, ESQ.
REV. WM. HILLS
W. EASON HUMPHREYS, ESQ.
A. ROSS ROBERTSON, ESQ.

Immediate Past President

J. P. PRATT, ESQ., K.C.

Past Presidents

NORMAN SOMMERVILLE, ESQ., K.C.
F. J. COOMBS, ESQ.
R. A. STAPELLS, ESQ.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c) and (d), must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article active resident and associate members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and non-resident members $3.00, payable on the first day of October in each year in respect of the Club year from May 1 to April 30 then current. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive

a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of April in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-President; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; the Executive Committee shall consist of these officers and 17 other members who with the officers shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President and such ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office till April 30 of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at a regular or special meeting to be held not less than four, and not more than six weeks before such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committee

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows

(a) Finance Committee.
(b) Speakers' Committee.
(c) Membership Committee.
(d) Constitution Committee.
(e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(f) Publicity Committee.
(g) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermission as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. The Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at a regular meeting of the Club held during the month of May.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

LIFE MEMBERS

Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert A.
Clouse, Dr. Elias
Coombs, F. J.
Fasken, Alex
Fetherstonhaugh, F. B., K.C.
Gibbons, John J.
Ham, Dr. Albert
Kernahan, W. T.
MacDougall, A. Roy
MacKay, John
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
McWhinney, W. J., K.C.
Murdoch, James Y.
Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, R. A.
Stapells, H. G.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Stuart, Lt.-Col. R. J.
Sweeney, Right Rev. Jas. F.
Tindall, H. B.
Wood, E. R.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Chas. E.
Adams, A. A.
Adams, G. W.
Adamson, H. R.
Agar, Norman E.
Aird, W. H.
Alberts, Edgar T.
Allen, Geo. H.
Alley, B. P.
Alley, Lt.-Col. Herbert R.
Ambrose, J. R. W.
Andison, T. H.
Angas, H. S.
Annis, H. C.
Appleton, C. N.
Archdekin, W. O.
Archibald, Dr. T. D.
Armour, Rev. J. B. M.
Armstrong, Harry E.
Armstrong, J. S. P.
Arnott, John P.
Ashlin, C. H. N.
Ashworth, E. M.
Atkinson, Fred
Atkinson, F. L.
Aykroyd, M. J.

Babbitt, G. W.
Bain, H. R.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, George A.
Baldwin, H. A.
Baldwin, L. H.
Balfour, Major G. B., K.C.
Ballard, B. W.
Band, Chas. S.
Barber, George
Barber, William
Bark, W. A.
Bastedo, Norman H.
Batten, Reg. A.
Batten, W. Howard
Baxter, Major W. James
Beairsto, A. H. C.
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beardsworth, H.
Beaton, A. H.
Beatty, C. G.
Beatty, Dr. Hy. A.
Beatty, W. L.
Becker, Dr. C. W.
Begg, Herbert
Bell, Dr. W. J.
Bennett, E. J.
Benson, D. F.
Berkeley, H. C.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Bernard, M.
Best, T. Harrison
Bevan, G. H.
Bickle, E. W.
Birkenshaw, J. H.
Bishop, G.
Bishop, H. H.
Blackburn, D. D.
Blackburn, F. J.

Blackstock, Col. G. G.
Bland, Rev. Salem G.
Blenkarn, Gordon F.
Boase, J. B.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bond, E. A.
Bond, Major F. L. C.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Bourlier, H. C.
Bowman, Tom E.
Box, Dr. Willard M.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Boyce, J. F.
Boyter, J. B.
Bradshaw, Thos.
Braithwaite, F. Y. W.
Breckenridge, James C.
Breithaupt, W. W.
Bremner, Donald G.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brockwell, Meredith
Brooke, Arthur R.
Brooks, W.
Broughall, Rev. Canon J. S.
Brown, F. I.
Brown, Henry
Brown, H. Lawlor
Brown, Stuart H.
Brown, W. E.
Browne, James
Bryce, Robt. A.
Bryson, R. N.
Bullett, S. H.
Burgess, C. H.
Burgess, F. A.
Burns, H. D.
Burns, Rev. Dr. R. N.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.

Calvert, A. Morrison
Cameron, Harry
Cameron, Capt. J. Duncan
Cameron, John D.
Cameron, M. C.
Cameron, W. A.
Campbell, Dr. Colin A.
Campbell, Geo. F.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carr, Walter D.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carrie, Nichol
Carruthers, Geo.
Carruthers, Geo. L.
Carson, James L.
Carter, J. Smyth
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Cashman, P. W.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caulder, J. A.
Caven, Dr. W. R.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chandler, Harry S.
Chapman, E. A.
Charles, Leo. E.
Charlesworth, Hector
Chave, B. W.
Cherry, P. G.
Chipman, J. H.
Chisholm, Lt.-Col. Geo. T.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, Dr. Harold
Clark, Herbert A., K.C.
Clark, Dr. Wm. J.
Clarkson, G. T.
Clarkson, R.
Cleland, Ralph H.
Cliff, Geo. J.
Clouse, F. L.
Coatsworth, Alan
Cody, Professor H. J.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Comber, W. W.
Complin, Gordon
Cooke, R. L.
Coon, H. J.
Corlett, W. E.
Corrigan, Fred S.
Corson, R. R.
Cork, J. Milton
Cosgrave, Provost F. H.

Coste, E. F.
Cottrelle, Geo. R.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Cowan, N. E.
Cowan, Major R. Cecil
Craick, W. A.
Craig, T. A.
Crang, J. H.
Crawford, F. J.
Crawford-Brown, Lyman
Crawford-Brown, Norman
Crighton, A. S.
Crockett, E.
Cross, Edward
Crossland, E. F.
Crowell, Samuel G.
Cudworth, W. O.

Dack, Stanford E.
Dallas, Rev. A. M.
Dalley, H. O.
Daly, R. O.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davidson, Jocelyn
Davies, J. E.
Davis, Bertrand N.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Day, Rev. Dr. Frank J.
Deacon, Col. F. H.
Dean, Rev. S. W.
Dean, W. G.
DeGuerre, H. W.
Denne, A. J.
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, Prof. N. W.
DeVries, Henry M.
DeWitt, H. N.
Dickey, A. J.
Dilworth, R. J.
Dilworth, W. A.
Dingle, Major Gordon R. M.
Dix, Wm. B.
Dixon, Rev. John H.
Donnelly, R. S.
Douglas, Howard R.
Douglas, J. S.
Drew, Lt.-Col. Geo. A., K.C.
Duern, Herbert
Duffett, Norman G.
Duggan, R. B.
Dumoulin, Walter H.
Duncan, E. J. B.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlap, D. M.
Dunlop, R. H.
Dunn, William
Dyke, Jas. E.

Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eayrs, Hugh S.
Eby, H. D.
Edge, Alfred
Edmonds, C. E.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Elgie, G. C.
Elliot, B. V.
Elliott, Gordon E.
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, E. F.
Ewing, Thos. H.

Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Falconer, Sir Robert
Fallis, Rev. Geo. O.
Fennell, Robert H.
Ferguson, B. H.
Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, John
Ferguson, M.
Fessenden, C. V. F.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fishman, P.
Fitch, P. F.
Fitzgerald, E.
Fleming, Donald M.

Fleming, G. O.
Fleming, Robert
Fletcher, S. S.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, Wm. J.
Fortner, C. H. C.
Foster, R. Leighton
Fox, E. D.
Frame, S. J.
Franceschini, James
Francis, G. C.
Frankel, Roy H.
Fraser, John A.
Fraser, W. Gordon
Freyseng, Edward J.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.
Fyvie, J. M.

Gaby, Dr. F. A.
Gairdner, J. A.
Gale, Geo. C.
Gale, R. H.
Gardiner, F. C.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Garton, Geo. M.
Gaunt, J. Wm.
Geary, B. Handley
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, Col. R. B., K.C.
Gibson, Wm. Robt.
Gifford, W. M.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gillespie, James
Gilmour, A. H.
Gilmour, Thos. W.
Glennie, Geo. H.
Goff, John B.
Goldberg, A. M. P.
Gooderham, A. E., Jr.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, Geo. H.
Gooding, T. W.
Gordon, A. B.
Gordon, T. A.
Gordon, Hon. W. A.
Gordon, Wm. E.
Gowdy, D. M.
Grabill, L. L.
Graham, Wilson
Grand, Percy F.
Grant, F. W.
Grant, W. G. F.
Gray, W. Douglas
Grasett, S.
Greeniaus, H. A.
Gresham, G. E.
Grier, A. Monro
Grier, Sir Wyly
Griffiths, F. D.
Guest, A. E.
Gullen, Dr. J. B.
Gully, Harold M.
Gundy, C. L.
Gundy, J. H.
Gunn, Edmond
Gunn, Major General Jno. A.

Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hall, I. C.
Hallman, Ivan
Ham, C. N.
Hambly, George
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamilton, John
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanks, Robert S.
Hanna, Wm. B.
Harcourt, R. M.
Harcourt, R. W.
Hardy, George
Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, Geo. N.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harman, John H. M.
Harpham, Cecil
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Jos. H.
Harris, Wm. W.
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Haskell, Arthur R.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.

Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, Dr. Chas. S.
Hawthorne, J. D.
Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hayden, Salter A.
Hearst, Sir Wm.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Heintzman, G. B.
Heintzman, Geo. C.
Henderson, Robert
Hengstler, H. C.
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Herbinson, Wm.
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Herod, Wesley J.
Heron, T. Earl
Hethrington, Major E. A.
Hewitt, Gordon W.
Hewson, E. G.
Higgins, Fred Page
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, Roy C.
Hills, Rev. Wm.
Hoadley, Hon. Geo.
Hobkirk, John F.
Hoblitzell, Fred G.
Hodgson, Dr. E. G.
Hogarth, D. M.
Hoidge, W. H.
Holliss, J. F.
Holmested, G. S.
Honan, James
Honey, Dr. E. M.
Hopkins, Howard
Hopkins, Oliver B.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Hoppe, O.
Horne, Cleeve
Houghton, E. J.
Houghton, E. O.
Houston, H. C.
Hotrum, Fredk.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howe, C. D.
Howe, H. J.
Howes, Joseph E.
Howes, Thos. H.
Huckvale, Robert
Huffman, Geo. E.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hull, W. V.
Humphrey, H. J.
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphreys, W. Eason
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hunter, H. T.
Huston, B. T.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchison, O. A.
Hyland, Gordon
Jackman, H. R.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
Jamieson, H. T.
Jamieson, John D.
Jardine, T. S.
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jeffrey, T. G.
Jefferis, C. A.
Jennings, P. H.
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald
Johnson, D. O.
Johnson, John
Johnson, Main
Johnston, Col. Baptist
Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, Dr. Samuel
Jones, A. W.
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, J. Erle
Jones, T. Roy
Junkin, Major Lawrence

Kee, H. A.
Keith, Gordon C.
Kellam, Geo. M.
Kennedy, J. deN.
Kennedy, Thos. L.
Kent, Herbert B.
Kerr, Rev. J. McD.
Kerr, John E.
Keys, Norman A.

Kilbourn, K. M.
Kilgour, R. C.
Kinghorn, A. A.
Kingsland, W. A.
Kingsmill, Col. W. B.
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kirkpatrick, W. R.
Kirschmann, A. N.
Knight, Cyril W.
Knight, Norman
Knowlton, Thos. E.
LaBine, Chas.
Laidlaw, John B.
Lamb, Col. H. J.
Lamb, John R.
Lamerton, A. F.
Lamont, W. H.
Lang, James
Langmuir, A. W.
Larrington, Arthur
Lascelles, G. A.
Lash, J. F.
Laughton, H. V.
Lavine, Arthur
Lawer, W. L.
Lawson, Frank G.
Lea, Herbert
Leacock, Geo. D.
Ledger, W. R.
Lee, H. T. I.
Lee, Lawlor
Leibel, Wm.
Lemon, W. E.
Lennie, E. D.
Leonard, T. D'Arcy
LeSueur, R. V.
Levey, L. E.
Lewis, H.
Lindsay, G. C.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linnell, A. P.
Lister, M. Parker
Lithgow, J. H.
Little, Wm.
Littlefield, Frank H.
Livesay, J. F.
Livingstone, J. A.
Lloyd, David S.
Lloyd, T. E.
Logan, C. S.
Lonsdale, Gordon J.
Lount, H. M.
Lovering, His Honor
  Judge Edgerton
Loveys, Geo. C.
Lucas, F. O.
Lucas, Hon. I. B.
Lyon, R. P.
MacAlpine, Col. C. D. H.
Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C. M., K.C.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
MacDonald, Charleton E.
Macdonald, C. S.
Macdonald, Hugh
MacDougall, Dr. J. B.
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacFarlane, E. S.
Mackie, Dickson
MacKay, Col. J. Keiller
MacKelcan, Fred R.
Mackellar, S. R.
Mackenzie, D. G.
MacKenzie, D. R.
MacKinnon, J. Bruce
Maclachlan, Wills
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Major Hugh C.
Maclean, Lt.-Col. J. B.
MacLeod, J. K.
MacLeod, Rev. Ronald
MacMillan, Dr. R J.
MacNamara, G. R.
Macrae, A. Montye
Macrae, E. M.
Magi, M. I.
Mallison, Fred
Mancantelli, Robert
Manley, James P.
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marsh, W. H.
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Marshall, Dr. T. R.
Martin, J. H.
Martin, S. O.
Massey, F. Vernon

Massey, Denton
Massie, R. H. L.
Matthews, Arnold C.
Mathews, Donald
Matthews, F. B.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Paul W.
Matthews, Hon. R. C.
Maunsell, J. Q.
Maxwell, John
Maybee, J. Edward
Medland, Gordon
Medland, T. J.
Meek, M. H.
Menzies, Thos. E.
Meredith, Arthur
Meredith, C. H.
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Merry, Martin N.
Mess, Lt.-Col. James
Middleton, A. N.
Miles, Arthur W.
Millar, J. C.
Millar, W. E.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, P. C.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Brig. Gen. C. H.
Mitchell, C. S. F.
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, Dr. J. P.
Mitchell, J. W.
Mitchell, Wm. G.
Mitchell, Lt-Col. W. G.
Mockridge, H. C. F.
Moffat, D. R.
Moffat, W. R.
Moncur, W. L.
Montgomery, Joseph
Monypenny, T. F.
Moore, F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
Moore, S. J.
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morine, Sir Alfred
Morine, A. Nevill
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morrison, L.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, Graham
Morrow, G. A.
Moysey, Arthur E.
Mulholland, Fred A.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Mulock, Hon. Sir. Wm.
Mulock, Col. W. P.
Munn, Chas. H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Muntz, G. H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Murphy, Gordon
Murphy, J. A.
Murphy, M. P.
Murray, H. W.
Muskett, Donald T.
Muskett, H. W.
Musson, C. J.
Mutch, C. M.

McAdam, S.
McBain, Alex.
McBride, James
McCamus, J. A.
McCarthy, Leigh M.
McCarthy, Leighton
McClain, John W.
McClelland, D. McK.
McCloskey, H. C.
McCollum, Dr. J. A.
McCoy, D. B.
McCoy, G. E.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Chas.
McCrea, John M.
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCulley, Joseph
McCulloch, Dr. R. J. P.
McDermott, Francis S.
McDonagh, Dr. A. J.
McDonnell, T. E.
McDougald, Duncan J.
McDowell, George
McElheran, Rev. Dr. R. B.
McGaw, T. D.

McGillivray, M. W.
McGillivray, T. A.
McIntosh, A. N.
McIntyre, K.
McKee, John W.
McKerrow, J. Milton
McKeown, S. W.
McKerrow, J. O.
McKinley, Dr. J. M.
McKinnon, W. L.
McLaren, J. B.
McLaughlin, Hugh J.
McLean, J. S.
McLeod, D. I.
McLeod, J. A.
McLeod, W. N.
McMaster, T. G.
McMillan, Norman
McMillen, John B.
McMullen, Robert
McMurray, Leonard L.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, Geo. G.
McPherson, R. S.
McWhinney, J. M.
McWilliams, C. E. P.
McWilliams, D. B.

Nash, Col. A. E., M.C.
Naylor, W. W.
Nash, Gerald
Needham, C. F.
Needham, R. J.
Neelands, E. V.
Neilly, Balmer
New, Ryland H.
Newman, Harry A.
Newton, B. G.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, James
Nicol, W. E.
Nimmo, Bruce D.
Noble, Wilfred G.
Norman, Edward
Norman, Sidney
North, J. A.
Northey, R. K.
Northway, A. G.
Norton, T. W. F.
Nunn, Norman A.

O'Brien, G. E.
O'Connor, W. M.
Olver, Lt.-Col. E. A., D.S.O., V.D.
Ormsby, R. P.
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osler, B. B.
Osler, F. G.
Osler, Glyn
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, Most Rev. Derwyn T.

Pakes, S. A.
Palmer, H. A.
Parker, Dr. Chas. B.
Parker, Robert
Parkinson, N. F.
Parmenter, R. H.
Partridge, A. G.
Patrick, W. G.
Patterson, H. F.
Patterson, J. P.
Patterson, R. E.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, R. John
Pearson, J. A.
Pearson, John
Peckover, Cecil R.
Pepall, Geo. T.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, H. M.
Pettipiere, R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Phipps, A. E.
Pike, Theodore
Plant, W. H.
Porter, D. H.
Porter, F. R.
Porter, Dr. Geo. D.
Potter, Chas. Ed.
Poucher, F. B.
Powell, H. F.
Powley, J.
Pratt, J. P., K.C.
Prentice, John L.

Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Pringle, J. F.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey
Pullen, Harry
Pullen, Frank
Pym, R. M.

Rae, Robert
Ransom, A. C.
Rawlinson, Lt.-Col. Walter
Reaves, Campbell
Reburn, E. T.
Reburn, H.
Reed, Edwin T.
Reed, Col. LeGrand
Reeve, P. B.
Reid, A. M.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Dr. Spence
Renfrew, Allen E.
Rennie, Thos.
Renison, Bishop R. J.
Ridout, G. L.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Ringland, H. S.
Ripley, Col. Blair
Ripley, Bruce T.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, Sir Chas. G. D.
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Roberts, H. A. D.
Robertson, A. Ross
Robertson, Major Chas. A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, Duncan
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. E.
Robertson, W. G.
Roewade, O.
Rogers, Alfred, Jr.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. A.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Rose, F. W.
Ross, Bruce D.
Ross, Douglas G.
Ross, J. D. F.
Ross, J. Roy
Ross, Hon. W. D.
Routley, Lt.-Col. F. S.
Routley, Dr. F. W.
Rowan, Donald H.
Rowell, Hon. N. W., K.C.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Rowley, Col. C. W.
Ruddy, E. L.
Ruddy, Robt.
Russell, T. A.
Ruttan, Lt.-Col. C. M.
Ryrie, Jack

Sachs, Rabbi Samuel
St. Charles, Dr. W. P.
St. Lawrence, F.
Samuel, Dr. Sigmund
Sanderson, C. R.
Sandham, E. A.
Sandwell, B. K.
Sargeant, E. S.
Saunders, E. M.
Saunders, S. J. Reginald
Sawers, Rev. Cannon F. J.
Scales, C. H.
Scheuer, Edmund
Schiff, Emile
Scott, S. C.
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, John R.
Scott, W. S.
Scroggie, Geo. E.
Seagram, J. S.
Sedgwick, Harry
Sedgwick, Joseph
Seitz, J. J.
Selby, Reginald
Selby, W. T. H.
Sexsmith, J. Alex.
Shannon, Frank
Shapley, W. H.
Sharp, Dr. Fletcher
Sharpe, Major C. T.
Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Shergold, Lt.-Col. C.

Sheilds, C. B.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Shortt, Maurice J.
Sibbald, S. J.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Simpson, James I.
Sinclair, Neil
Singer, J. G.
Smallpeice, V. N.
Smith, A. L.
Smith, C. B.
Smith, Dr. David King
Smith, E. Colin
Smith, F. D. L.
Smith, Major Howell
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Paul L.
Smith-Ross, James
Smythe, Col. R. E.
Snider, C. H. J.
Snively, Major A. C.
Sommerville, Norman
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Spears, J. W.
Spence, John D.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Stanford, F. T.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stephenson, H. R.
Stevenson, H. H.
Stewart, A. G.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, Dunlop
Stewart, E. E.
Stewart, R. T.
Stewart, Wm. J., O.B.E.
Stodart, A. B.
Stoddart, W. H.
Strachan, James
Strathy, G. B., K.C.
Stubington, Geoffrey
Stupart, Sir Fredk.
Suydam, J. C.

Taylor, Donald
Taylor, E. Geo. T.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, Jos.
Taylor, J. G.
Taylor, W. D.
Tedman, Harry M.
Thom, Kenneth
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Geo. W.
Thompson, Gordon V.
Thompson, J. W.
Thomson, H. G.
Thorn, A. C.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Tory, John A.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tucker, Edward J.
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James
Tuteur, M. P.
Twiss, B. A.
Tyrrell, H. V.
Tyrell, Wm.
Tyrell, E. C.

Urquhart, Norman C.

Van Blaricom, G. B.
Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Lane, J. F.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Vaughan, J. J.
Verral, Geo. W.
Vickers, Merion
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Waldie, Kemp
Waldie, R. S.
Walker, Charles
Walker, Denzil
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Walker, Wm.
Wallace, H. LeRoy
Wallace, Malcolm W.
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walsh, J. E.

Ward, Rev. James E.
Wardlaw, J. W.
Wardlaw, T. D.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, Geo. R.
Warwick, R. D.
Waters, W. Keith
Watson, George E.
Watson, H. E. G.
Watson, J. Graeme
Watson, J. P.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Col. W. H.
Watson, Dr. W. V.
Watt, J. L.
Webster, Howard
Wegenast, F. W., K.C.
Welch, Frank
Welch, Thos. A.
Werlich, Angus A.
Weston, J. F.
Wheatley, E.
White, Sir Thos.
Whitehead, J. H.
Whiteley, J.
Whittingham, Major H.
Wildblood, G. W.
Wilkes. F. Hilton
Wilkinson, E. H.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, H. H.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willoughby, J. A.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Geo.
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, R. Frank
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Wolfenden, Hugh H.
Wood, F. P.
Wood, L. M.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H. F. D.
Woods, Q. C.
Wright, E. Frank
Wright, L. V.

Young, Frank
Young, John A.
Young, W. T.

Zinkan, Dr. E. I.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Aitchison, J. F., Montreal, P.Q.
Baker, Robert P., London, Ont.
Beaumont, Jos., Glen Williams, Ont.
Boyd, Mossom deG., Bobcaygeon, Ont.
Bradley, E., Oshawa, Ont.
Cawthra-Elliott, Major Gen. H. M., Lakeview, Ont.
Davis, Aubrey, Newmarket, Ont.
Fraser, Alasdair D. R. Windsor, Ont.
Gibson, W. R., Grimsby, Ont.
Grainger, A. H., Moncton, N.B.
Hitchcock, C. H., Sudbury, Ont.
Hughes, Gordon R., Winnipeg, Man.
Jackson, E. H., Simcoe, Ont.
Kidd, Hon T. Ashmore, Kingston, Ont.
Lovell, E. A., Oshawa, Ont.
Mackay, G. F. A., Gormley, Ont.
McCrea, T. Arthur, Rosseau, Ont.
McIntosh, C. H., Montreal, P.Q.

McLaughlin, Col. R. S.,
Oshawa, Ont.
McLean, W. A.,
Pickering, Ont.
Over, Spencer H.,
Providence, R.I., U.S.A.
Ponton, Col. W. N.,
Belleville, Ont.
Raven, Rev. C. C.,
Victoria, B.C.
Rice, H. E.,
Huntsville, Ont.
Richardson, Dr. R. N. C.,
Islington, Ont.
Sinclair, Dr. D. J.,
Woodstock, Ont.
Smith, W. Harland,
Oakville, Ont.
Steele, C. E.,
Port Colborne, Ont.
Taylor, R. F.,
Victoria, B.C.
Whidden, Dr. Howard P.,
Hamilton, Ont.
Wideman, Harvey,
Markham, Ont.